THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

LEONARD HODGSON, D.D.

VOLUME XXVII.

JULY—DECEMBER, 1933

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING

CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

attention, and perhaps we should say an affection, which are reflected in a multitude of ways, not least in the Press. That does not mean that at any moment criticism, and even attack, may not blaze up again. But it does mean that in such an eventuality the Church would know, and would let others know, to what it bore witness. Not its worldliness, but its other-worldliness, its faith in the supernatural, would be its offence. That is a very remarkable change, and one of which the end cannot be foreseen. The Church is recognized today for what it is, the divinely founded and divinely commissioned Body of Christ, the spiritual community, proclaiming with whatever halting in its speech the Word of God, and instinct with a life and a joy that are the best interpreters of heaven.

Secular conditions and administrative wisdom have contributed largely to this result. New facilities of travel and communication have made gatherings of Church-people in the dioceses, and more centrally still, far easier than before, and have opened them to a larger and more democratic membership; so much so that our danger now is not that we should forsake the assembling of ourselves together, but that we should assemble too much. On the administrative side, the sudden death of Sir Stanford Downing has come as a reminder of the immense debt which every nook and cranny of the Church's life owes to the quiet and far-sighted labours of the Ecclesiastical Commission. But neither of these causes, great as they are, suffices to account for the rich intensity of corporate life and worship which characterizes the Church today. That comes primarily from above, from the outpouring of the Spirit, and especially from all that the Church has learnt of the place and meaning of the sacraments in its life. In this process the Catholic movement has played a leading part, and it is for this that we say *Laus Deo*.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND PERSONAL RELIGION

I

WE live in an age of celebrations. The fear lest we forget is always with us, and for every committee that passes away another is formed to make some new memorial, perpetuate some further sage or saint or martyr or hero. Most of our commemorations, however, concern an individual: a Shakespeare, a Goethe, a Hegel, a Karl Marx; only occasionally, as in 1929, do we commemorate events such as an Act, the climax of a movement for Catholic Emancipation, or in 1932 a Reform Bill, or in 1933 the emancipation of the slaves and the Oxford Movement.

Why, then, should the Church of England commemorate the centenary of the Catholic Revival in its midst? I say the Catholic Revival, for what is historically called the Oxford Movement is in part (though not wholly) the translation into the religious life and organization of the Church of England of the Romantic Revival, the Romantic Revolt, the Renascence of Wonder, which had half a century earlier transformed European literature, art, music, philosophy and theology. The Romantic Movement, as the expression in articulate and interpretable form of the mystery wherewith man's whole being and progress from the cradle to the grave is beset, enhanced man's sense of the unseen, his impatience of the aridities of a narrow rationalism, his apprehension of the claims of feeling, of intuition, of experimental religion to validity and value, and made possible and inevitable in the Church of England the Catholic Revival, accelerated in the *Tracts for the Times*, and attested in the saintly and heroic lives of its evangelists. So marked is the influence of the Catholic Revival upon the corporate life, discipline and devotion of the Church of England, that we are in some danger of overlooking and underestimating its significance as a revival of personal discipline, personal devotion, personal experiential and experimental religion. The leaders of the Oxford Movement were men of individual personal conviction, conversion and progressive religious experience: the disciples of the Movement were moved not so much by doctrine as by discipleship. They were led by great individuals, great personalities, and they followed such leadership as individuals, greatly. The difference in *quality* of personality and personal religion is easily seen by contrasting the first thirty years of the eighteenth century with the first three decades of last century. A Wesley might indeed follow a Pope and a Sacheverell, but a Keble, a Newman, a

Pusey and an "Ideal" Ward could follow only upon a Blake, a Wordsworth and a Coleridge. This experience of personal leadership, personal sanctity, personal religion was exactly what the situation required. The Church of England saw the new democracy created by the Reform Act of 1832 as indeed a Macedonia needing help: it perceived the need, awakened from its own lethargy and indolence, and embarked upon its new responsibilities with all the ardour of a newly dubbed knight of old essaying some high romantic quest for the lady of his dreams. The new democracy needed instruction, education, secular and religious: the Catholic Revival gave it schools and schoolmasters in every village and studded all England with new foundations, whether at Radley, Bradfield, Denstone or Lancing, rivalling Winchester and Eton. The new democracy toiled in factory and mill and mine, little cared for by the avaricious employers of the day: the Catholic Revival gave it beauty in worship, beauty in churches, beauty in the devoted lives of its priests, beauty through its artists, its musicians and its poets. It gave the humblest sempstress a consecrated vocation in her home and in her church. The new democracy needed leadership, courage, and resource: the Catholic Revival gave it all three—a Pusey, a Keble, a Hurrell Froude; and in later years a line of great Bishops: King of Lincoln, Gore of Worcester, Birmingham and Oxford, Frank Weston of Zanzibar, and Edward Talbot of Winchester. Has any similar movement, contemporaneous or earlier, been so distinguished for the variety, excellence and individuality of its teachers, saints and martyrs? The new democracy needed inspiration and the fellowship of saints: the Catholic Revival gave both in the person of a Benson, a Dolling, a Stanton and a Lowder. The prophetic utterance which in a less specifically Christian form the new democracy heard in a Carlyle, a Ruskin, or a William Morris, it heard anew and with even greater acceptance and results in the eloquence of Dean Church, Liddon and Scott Holland, who made St. Paul's a metropolitan church indeed and a compelling shrine in Babylon. The personal romance without which the Gospel is neither news nor good news was given again to the Church of England in the adventures of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, the revival of the Religious Orders, the spiritual enfranchisement of women, and the sanctification of the slums. And for a hundred years the Catholic Revival has given to the new democracy that to which democracy will ever increasingly respond, a cause for which to think, a cause for which to live, a cause for which to suffer, and a cause for which to die. To think: the Catholic Revival has meant the vindication of the Faith through a scholarship which by its integrity, independence and illumination has gained the

respect of the scientist and philosopher, and the assured affection of the people. And how? Through the personal achievements in learning and the personal altitude of thought from the time of Edward Pusey to that of A. E. Taylor in this our day. To live: not merely in the known records of such men as that poet-saint of whom the world of letters, the English-speaking world, and this country will ever be proud—Keble of Hursley; or Lowder of St. Peter's, London Docks, whose character so well befits the soldier-saint depicted by Browning in the *Ring and the Book*; or of such living stalwarts and defenders of the Faith, venerable and venerated, as Lord Halifax, *nomen venerabile, clarum et illustrissimum*. Not merely in such known records as theirs, but in the unrecorded, little known, but celestially remembered lives of countless parish priests and devoted laymen who were content to witness in their personal piety and personal lives of daily sacrifice, in trivial round and common task, do we perceive that the roots of the Oxford Movement are buried deep in personal religion; its flower is the flower of personal piety, its fruit is the perpetuation of personal prayer and personal sacrifice. To suffer and to die. Suffering is personal, death is personal, and in death and suffering the Movement has had, continues to have, and if it is to live must ever have, its martyrs and its saints. Suffering is its seal, and sanctity its signature.

II

To emphasize the transformation of personal values which the Catholic Revival effected it is well to remember that while the Wesleyan movement of a century earlier had magnificently evoked and nourished a vital and personal religion in the countryside and town, it had scarcely troubled the secluded dignity and ease in which the Lords of the Council, nobility and gentry lived, contemptuous of enthusiasms. It is difficult for us, accustomed to the dignity and beauty which now characterize our parish and cathedral services, and familiar with the unremitting devotion of our parish clergy and their Bishops, to realize the somnolence into which the Church had fallen a hundred years ago. Despite some notable exceptions, it was possible a century ago for a Bishop to draw the stipend of a see which during a tenure of thirty-four years he never visited. It was possible for ordination candidates to be examined in a cricket tent or upon the hunting field by a booted and spurred examining chaplain or Bishop. On Easter Day at St. Paul's Cathedral in 1800 there was only one celebration of the Holy Communion—namely, at noon—and to that but six people came. Another examining chaplain examined a candidate while shaving, and terminated

it when the candidate had construed two words. Personal religion is difficult to discern in such cases. No wonder Dr. Arnold judged that no human power could save the Church as it then stood. On the other hand, the practice of fasting and of a daily service never wholly died out, but it needed more than the staid godliness of the old High Church divines to rekindle the enthusiasm of the people. Yet how sorely even the educated classes needed proper instruction in the decencies and civilities of worship may be seen in the extraordinary outburst of Peter Maurice, chaplain of New College, when he visited Littlemore in 1837, the year of Queen Victoria's accession, and saw to his horror a plain cross upon the communion table:

"I felt an indescribable horror stealing over me as I carried my eye towards the eastern wall of the building, and beheld a plain naked cross, either of stone, or a good imitation of it, rising up and projecting out of the wall, from the centre of the table of communion, and forming the fulness of one of those arches which are so ornamentally arranged in sevenfold perfection within the rails. There, adjoining the gates of the said railed fence, was the hassock upon which, not long before, a minister of the Reformed and Protestant Church of England had been kneeling. I could not divest my mind of that fond delusion of the man of sin, who openly bows down before the image of the Cross, and worships the painted wood or cold stone. May my natural eye never fall upon such a degrading spectacle."

It was Keble's Assize Sermon on National Apostasy, preached at St. Mary's Church, Oxford, on July 14, 1833, which gave the nascent Catholic Revival its first great impetus and caused Newman to regard that date as the birthday of the Oxford Movement. Shortly afterwards, Hurrell Froude, Hugh Rose, William Palmer and Arthur Perceval met for four days in the Deanery, Hadleigh, and although that meeting was not immediately productive, it presently led to the inauguration of the famous *Tracts for the Times*. The publication of these tracts first revealed to the Church of England what the dissenting bodies and the Roman Church had earlier realized: the possibilities and publicity value of the press and of pamphleteering. The tracts had an astonishing vogue, a marked educational and controversial effect, and powerfully accelerated the establishment of two Church newspapers (the *Guardian* and the *Church Times*), and the two great series of Libraries of the Fathers and Anglo-Catholic Theology. The subsequent success of the Society of SS. Peter and Paul, of the Faith Press, of Mowbrays, and of the Morehouse Publishing Company, may all be in part ascribed to the discovery of publicity value in the *Tracts for the Times*. Team work was understood as never before, and team work has

characterized the Movement ever since, reaching its climax, perhaps, in the superlative organization of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses. If, then, we are loyal to the Church, renewed as it has been and is by the Movement and its team work, ought not each and all to participate in the Centenary Celebrations and share in the toil and cost ?

III

We can but glance at some of the more salient features of the Movement as it manifested personality in religion. The Catholic Revival was from the outset, and always has been, truly evangelical in character. What were those golden tones that charmed—nay, that converted—the congregation at St. Mary's, Oxford, a hundred years ago but the evangel of one who was himself most truly converted to religion, most truly aware of the luminous reality of God and his own soul, most truly seized with the awfulness of the relationship, the personal relationship, between the creature and the Creator. If Wesley was the evangelist of the English countryside two centuries ago, John Henry Newman, our English Chrysostom, was the evangelist of the Common Room one hundred years ago. Today the so-called Oxford Group Movement pursues its evangelical way with all the resources that modern appliances can give, but a century ago the group movement, unadvertised and unproclaimed, began in the Common Room of Oriel.

As an evangelical revival within the Church of England, then, the Oxford Movement needed from the outset a saint. It found him in Keble, whose unobtrusive ministry of thirty years at Hursley was such a writing in souls as could only be enclosed in the book of life, but not for publication. The Movement needed also from the outset a dialectic and a wit: it found both wit and dialectic in Hurrell Froude, who died too soon; and in W. G. Ward, whom his University knew not how to retain in loyalty to the Church of England. It needed, further, a more massive scholarship than even Newman could give it, and this it received and retained for fifty years in the person of E. B. Pusey, whose own deep interior piety led him to be a prime mover in the revival of that most personal form of religion, the life under vows, and whose unshaken loyalty kept the Church of England from what may well have been complete schismatic shipwreck.

But, above all, at its outset the Movement needed personal leadership, not only in the controversial fight, but also in the spiritual combat, the rekindling of the glowing fires of personal religion. This it found in Newman. The fact that twelve years later Newman passed on to Christian service under another

flag but not under another Master, in another regiment but not in another army, under other marching orders and regulations but not for a different cause, but still for the furtherance of the Kingdom, still for this same Jesus to whose vision he was not disobedient—the fact, I say, of his transferred service must not be allowed to diminish our recognition of the debt which the Movement, the Church of England, and indeed Christianity, owes to Oxford's greatest preacher, subtlest thinker and loftiest pen and utterance. It is Newman who refutes Arnold's judgment of Oxford as the home of lost causes and impossible ideals. No University which produces a Newman, no Movement which has the leadership of a Newman need ever despair of being lost or unattainable. Newman's subtle argument was potent in his own day, potent in the generation succeeding, and potent in its long-unrecognized virility and fertility in our own day. Without the *Grammar of Assent*, the subtlest solvent of doubt and richest fertilizer of theology, and without the *Apologia*, the most moving vindication of personal sincerity of soul in modern apologetics, neither *Lux Mundi* nor *Essays Catholic and Critical* would have been possible, and the *Faith of a Moralist* would have remained undeclared. Instead of the bloodless ballet of metaphysical categories, John Henry Newman gave, like all the other protagonists of the Revival, the very life-blood and essence of spiritual personal religion.

IV

It is often supposed that the Movement was exclusively academic and ecclesiastical. This is very far from the truth, and that it was partially so is a truth of which we need not be ashamed. But too little recognition has been given to the influence of the Catholic Revival in the development of hymnody and the Christian press. If Methodism owed very much to the instant appeal of Wesley's hymns, the Oxford Movement owed not less in its first phase to the consummate pamphleteering of the *Tracts for the Times*, in its second phase to the consecrated journalism of the *Guardian* and the *Church Times*, and particularly to *Hymns Ancient and Modern* seventy years ago and the *English Hymnal* over a quarter of a century ago. Who can estimate the influence upon private devotion of the Eucharistic hymns of, say, W. F. Bright, or the influence upon the deepest conception of worship of the author of *Ye Watchers and ye holy ones*? Which of us does not owe to these lofty utterances and true poems some of the greatest moments of our own personal spiritual growth? Indeed, what English literature in general owes to the Movement has not yet been adequately appraised. Whether in the still appreciated work of Miss Charlotte Yonge

and Miss Sewell, or in the unforgettable and mighty though fragmentary verse of Hawker of Morwenstow, or in the outspread splendours of the *Testament of Beauty*, English literature has been enriched by writers who drew their inspiration from that personal religion which the Movement engendered in them. English letters and English journalism for a century past are indeed unintelligible apart from the Catholic revival, and in like manner English political history for a hundred years was largely dominated by two great sons of the Oxford Movement, Gladstone and Lord Salisbury. What does not England owe to the ministration of Hawarden and Hatfield parish churches?

We can but glance at the effect of the Movement upon not only the building of great churches, but also upon the organization of great parishes. If the parochial system after its long history of wellnigh 1,300 years has shown unexpected resistance to decay and renewal of vitality, it has been in large measure due to the vision and ability and consecrated selflessness of men like Mackonochie, Stanton, Lowder, Wainwright and Dolling, who have bequeathed to their successors an unexhausted inspiration and genius in spiritual reconstruction. We need no longer regard the city of St. Sulpice as supreme and unapproachable in parochial efficiency: we have our Portsea and St. Peter's, London Docks.

But perhaps the most signal expression of the basic personalism and evangelicalism of the Catholic Revival is to be found in two particular fields: that of education and that of the revival of community life in the Church of England.

That children have souls to be saved as well as bodies to be tended and minds to be nurtured has always been a vital truth seized by every priest influenced by the Oxford Movement. It was Hawker of Morwenstow who gave to the children of his village school two perfect Christmas poems and that no less perfect hymn No. 571 in *Ancient and Modern*, "Sing to the Lord the children's hymn." It was the National Society which, older than but contemporaneous with, and largely inspired by the Movement, set before itself the ideal of a Church school in every parish, Church training colleges and a godly and instructed schoolmaster in every school. And it was Nathaniel Woodard, a characteristic son of the Movement, dogmatic, ardent, shrewd, mystic, visionary and born money-getter, who eighty-five years ago began his plea for the education of the middle classes, and in realizing his dream of a great system of public schools for the middle classes revolutionized the English conception of educational organization and administration. Multiple shops and chain stores are no invention of America, no invention of the business man. Nathaniel Woodard's idea of a chain of schools,

an organized system of schools, combined the best of the mediæval monastic schools with the best of the modern idea of common control, withal independent of the sterilizing influence of a secular state. What William of Wykeham gave to mediæval England in his foundations at Winchester, that Nathaniel Woodard gave to Victorian England in his foundations at Lancing and elsewhere. Who will do for the modern universities what they did for the public schools? Not less far reaching, and not less the outcome of the personal religion, the growth in holiness fostered by the Oxford Movement, has been the revival of the life under vows for both men and women in the Church of England. When Dr. Arnold despaired of the Church a hundred years ago, he forgot the possibilities of monasticism. No one a hundred years ago supposed that the English Church would ever again see the monk's cowl and the nun's hood familiar and honoured in our midst. Yet once the idea of personal experimental religion is firmly grasped, once a personal relationship with Jesus is established, once the call to perfection is clearly heard, the ideal of holiness in the home and of holiness in the cloister is perceived to be one and the same ideal, and the life under vows, vows in the home and vows in the cloister are sought and accepted as integral to the Christian life. All that the late Baron von Hügel stressed in the intertwined religious sanctions of the life under vows in the married estate and the life under vows in the celibate estate is exemplified in the lives of Pusey, Carter and Mason, of Miss Sellon, Marion Hughes, Harriet Monsell and their spiritual successors. The battle for the home is in reality fought in the spiritual combat in the cloister. Consecrated Christian marriage and consecrated Christian celibacy sustain and justify each other. And no less the far-flung influence upon foreign missions of this revival of community life forms one of the glorious chapters in the history of the Oxford Movement.

Of the achievements of the Movement in art, architecture, craftwork—*e.g.*, needlework and stained glass, in music and the reform of the Church music; of its psychological prescience in the revival of confession, the direction of penitents and the lesser Sacraments; of the liturgical revival and the restoration of the dignity and civilities of worship and of the rejuvenation of theology as the queen of sciences, all direct effects (continuing to this present) of the Movement, there is no space to write, but perhaps the attempt may be made in conclusion to summarize what we English churchmen of today owe to it and what there is yet to do for it.

As linked with the Romantic Revival and the Renascence of Wonder, we owe to the Movement our recovery of the sense

of wonder, mystery and awe in religion corporate and personal, public and private. As linked with the concurrent movements in scientific and historical research we owe to it that reverence for Truth and History which is expressed in the best Biblical and theological learning of our day. As Catholic in thought, Catholic in feeling, and Catholic in practice, we owe to it not only the restoration of beauty, seemliness and order in our liturgical exercises, but also our renewed passion in the cause of Christian missions and Christian reunion, both impossible except under the inspiration of a truly Catholic Christianity. As genuinely evangelical in its nature, we owe to it the unswerving maintenance of social morality, economic justice, and corporal works of mercy as binding upon a Christian society and integral to any Christian sociology, so that the Christian conscience cannot be quiet, cannot be patient, but must resist and contend against the evils of sweating, ignorance, and slums, and must refuse to allow the inevitability of the degradation of sex. But, above all, as originating in great personalities, fostered by men and women whose own lives were lives of consecration, prayer and sacrifice, the Oxford Movement has restored to us in the fulness of its splendour the ideal of personal religion, personal devotion to a personal Lord, expressed in the life of prayer and holiness within the reach of all, and claiming each and all not only in the sanctity of consecrated marriage and in the sanctity of consecrated celibacy, but also in that consecrated citizenship which alone can bring Christ's Kingdom upon earth.

ALBERT A. COCK.

MUSIC OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL

MUSICIANS did not take kindly to the Oxford Movement. The substance of Keble's famous assize sermon of 1833 probably seemed to have very little to do with them. Few of them were close enough readers of *Tracts for the Times* to realize that the doctrines inculcated must, if translated into terms of church worship, presently find artistic expression of one sort or another, in which inevitably they would have to play their part.

At that time church music was firmly entrenched in the cathedrals; outside the cathedral tradition of Morning and Evening Prayer it had practically no existence. The cathedral organ lofts were as likely to be inimical to any change as were the cathedral pulpits. The major appointments were held by men whose names are still honoured for their musicianship, but no one of them leapt to the artistic significance of the new teaching. William Crotch, first Principal of the Royal Academy of

Music, was Professor of Music at Oxford. He brought some critical discernment to bear on the choice of hymn melodies, and his collection of *Psalm Tunes for Cathedrals and Parish Churches* (1836) is held to be one of the pioneer works of hymnody. Thomas Attwood, pupil of Mozart and composer of the melodious setting of "Come, Holy Ghost," was organist of St. Paul's Cathedral; James Turle, composer of "Turle in D," a dull service in the eighteenth century manner, had just begun his long reign at Westminster Abbey. Not through him was the cathedral tradition likely to suffer a change into something rich and strange. Attwood's godson (named after him), Thomas Attwood Walmisley, was elected to the organistship of Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1833, and in his music there is some hint of the better things to come from thence half a century later. More immediately important, however, was the fact that almost simultaneously a young organist whose patronymic was already famous in ecclesiastical and musical circles was appointed to Hereford Cathedral, and instantly began the reform of that stronghold of Handel, the Three Choirs' Festival.

This was Samuel Sebastian Wesley, greatest church musician of his generation, and the only composer for the English Church Service in the middle of the nineteenth century whose works are acknowledged to be great music apart from their immediate purpose. S. S. Wesley was a doughty champion of reform in cathedral establishments, though less on ecclesiastical than artistic grounds. His pamphlet, *A Few Words on Cathedral Music*, attacked slovenliness in the execution of the choral service, and his personal labours in four cathedral organistships—Hereford, Exeter, Winchester and Gloucester—steadfastly upheld the ideal of conscientiousness and efficiency in the performance of choir duties.

Wesley's fine anthem, "Blessed be the God and Father," provides evidence of the kind of makeshift on which its composer waged war. It was written for a Sunday at Hereford when his choir consisted of boys and one bass, and it is ingeniously devised (with *ad libitum* alto and tenor parts), so that it may be performed with only this skeleton choir. But if Wesley once consented to make the best of a bad job, his whole life was a protest against badness and jobbery in cathedral organizations. His campaign was consonant with the aims of the Oxford Movement, but was no part of it. It is significant that his one important contribution to the music of Holy Communion, his Service in E, was composed during an interlude in his cathedral career when Dr. Hook persuaded him to accept the post of organist at Leeds Parish Church. The Communion Service in E, written in 1845, is imperfect, consisting only of two settings

of Responses to Commandments (called *Kyrie*), an elaborate Creed, and a disproportionately concise *Sanctus*. The *Gloria in Excelsis* in C, written separately, was included in this service by Dr. Garrett, who subsequently edited it for Novello. Fine as much of the music is, it shows little of the intention to treat the Eucharistic act as a whole, which was the essence of the Oxford teaching. The Creed, *Sanctus* and *Gloria* are separate numbers in a service which also contains equally independent settings of Morning and Evening Canticles.

Wesley was very much a musician of his time, and his time was that when Mendelssohn and Spohr were the dominating influences in English musicianship. The latter is distinctly reflected in Wesley's own musical idiom, particularly in the use of harmonic chromaticisms. The former's propaganda on behalf of Bach naturally endeared him to one whose father, Sam Wesley, had initiated him into something of his own fanatical faith in that master. Mendelssohn and the revival of Bach's counterpoint, Spohr and the glow of a romantic emotionalism (which presently he came to appreciate also in Schumann), were the bases of the new musical language which S. S. Wesley placed at the service of his cathedral choirs. He was scornful of archaisms; he jeered at the nincompoops who supposed that breves and semibreves were the hall-mark of a true church style, and derided the signs of a reviving interest in Plainsong and the "High Church" wailing of Gregorian tones in place of the tuneful and pleasantly harmonized Anglican chants.

Mendelssohn himself, when he visited Rome and heard the Offices of Holy Week sung by the Sistine choir, had been moved to irritation by such "insignificant, dull music" preserved as a sacred tradition. He wrote: "If at that time they had neither the feeling nor the capacity to write in a different style, at all events we have now the power to do so." Wesley's impatience with the inept efforts of the tentative Catholic Revival in the English Church is easily understandable, but in taking a thoroughly Mendelssohnian view of it he missed the opportunity of his life. He alone amongst cathedral musicians was in a sufficiently commanding position to give the direction and guidance which the musical expression of the Movement sorely needed, and he gave none.

As the Oxford Movement passed into its second stage of a sporadic revival of Catholicism in the parishes of every diocese in the country, it fell a victim to lapses of artistic taste in every direction. The iconoclastic "restorations" of the ancient parish churches have become notorious. Surpliced choirs in pitch-pine choir stalls were forced into chancels never intended to be

used for such a purpose. Organs were planted in side chapels, obliterating mediæval monuments and obscuring the light from east windows. The new churches built specially for the kind of worship which it was proposed to hold in them were in happier case as regards internal arrangements and ornaments, but they were equally without artistic guidance in the matter of what should be sung; and when they could afford to engage expert musicians as organists and choirmasters, it frequently happened that their expertness was that of the cathedral organ loft extended by some experience of secular music and an uncomprehending glimpse of High Mass in a continental church.

The music of the Catholic Revival became increasingly at the mercy of the amateur and the commercialist. In the latter part of the Victorian era "High" churches fell into the habit of struggling through Mattins—Psalms and Canticles gabbled to Gregorian tones which the organist attempted to sweeten with Spohr-like harmonies—and then, before an altar loaded with lights, bursting forth into the masses (more or less mangled) of Mozart, Weber, Gounod, or Kalliwoda. No wonder that Anglo-Catholicism gained the reputation with an untheological-minded laity of being something foreign and meretricious, a reputation which it is very far from having lived down at the present day.

It has to be remembered that in the middle of the last century knowledge of any music earlier than that of the eighteenth century was of the most haphazard kind, even among professed musicians. In England it was almost non-existent. The cathedrals preserved a few remnants of older tradition in the responses and litany of Tallis, and an occasional anthem by his contemporaries. The old English polyphonic masses were as completely forgotten as was the ceremonial of the Sarum Use. There were no materials at hand from which to reconstruct an English Catholic Use either in music or ceremonial. The choice lay between adapting and, as it were, filling out the meagre cathedral usage with music in similar style written for Communion and occasional Offices, and copying wholesale from an equally debased continental type. It can hardly be wondered at that clergy, impatient to restore the Mass to its central position in the worship of the Church, seized on the latter as their one course of effective and immediate action.

Nevertheless, a real attempt was made, although one necessarily inadequate to deal with the unprecedented situation, to provide a musical parallel to the new liturgical views which the Oxford Movement promulgated. William Dyce's *Order of Daily Service* (1843) was a careful adaptation of Merbecke's historic *Booke of Common Praier Noted* to the Offices

of the current Prayer Book. The chapel in Margaret Street (now All Saints, Margaret Street), famous as the first London church to institute a weekly sung Eucharist, had secured as its organist Richard Redhead, brought up as a chorister of Magdalen College, Oxford, a man who, beginning with the publication of *Laudes Diurnæ*, a psalter pointed for singing the Gregorian tones, devoted a long life both at All Saints and subsequently at St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington, to the provision of music suited to such parochial needs as these churches represented.

The publication by the Gregorian Association of *The English Gradual* may be taken as another landmark thirty years later in the revival of Plainsong. But before such music could make a decisive return into the services of the Anglican Communion a long process of scholarly research had to be undertaken on the Continent; principles of the original art had to be redetermined, threshed out by the controversy between the rival schools of Ratisbon and Solesmes. Possibilities of adaptation to the English Liturgy had to be explored by such students as the Rev. G. H. Palmer and Dr. W. H. Frere, now Bishop of Truro. The resources thus placed at the disposal of English Church musicians may be said to be now only just ready for use at the beginning of the second century of the Catholic Revival. Few churches apart from those of Communities have yet begun to realize what they are. Plainsong is melody, but it is a melody based on a tonality far removed from that of the current major and minor scales; it is rhythmic, but its rhythm is not that of duple and triple times. It still remains an open question how far such a melody can be commended to the taste of a modern-minded laity. The strongest point in its favour is that out of church that same modern-minded laity has recently rediscovered a secular melody based, as far as tonality is concerned, on similar principles. Now that the late Cecil Sharp and the Folksong Society have put modal folksongs in the mouths of English singers there seems no reason why those same singers should not lift their voices in plainsong hymns and the ordinary of the Mass. Still the acclimatization of the majority of English church-goers to plainsong services has still to be effected. We are here concerned with history, and the fact is that the attempt to revive plainsong as an adjunct of the Oxford Movement was a failure, because a hundred years ago no one knew enough about it to give it an artistic *raison d'être*.

The adaptation of the existing cathedral type of service to the new needs of parochial worship was more fruitful, although this too had its attendant dangers. Much has been said recently about the evils of the parochial church choirs aping cathedrals, of the mistake of attempting to sing responses in four-part

harmony without altos, and of choirs which can boast only one husky tenor chanting the psalms antiphonally. But as far as the Offices of Mattins and Evensong were concerned, the cathedrals did provide a good working model for the newly surpliced parochial choirs. After a certain amount of trial and error these choirs produced a normal type of chanting and hymn singing, a kind of simplified cathedral service, which proved well within the capacity of amateur singers. Many amateur choirs both in town and country now perform it on Sundays better, because with more evidence of reverent devotion, than do the professional choirs of the cathedrals who perform it daily.

Where these choirs were at a loss half a century or so ago was in the singing of the Holy Communion, for which they had no working model either to imitate or improve on. It is in this connection that the type of church music represented by the names of John Stainer and George Garrett deserves to be remembered with gratitude, even though we may not desire to perpetuate much of it in the service lists of today.

Stainer as the pupil of Sir Frederick Gore Ouseley may be regarded as the direct product of the Oxford Movement. Ouseley, scholar, priest and musician, who inherited his baronetcy from his father and with it a considerable fortune, determined to devote both his fortune and his great personal gifts to the service of church music. He especially desired to place the tradition of the cathedral service beyond the reach of reforming Cathedral Commissions, and with that in view founded in 1854 his College of St. Michael, Tenbury, for the perpetual performance of the choral daily service by a choir of scholarship boys and lay clerks. John Stainer at the age of sixteen became organist of the newly-founded College, of which Ouseley, lately elected Professor of Music at Oxford, was himself the first Warden.

While Ouseley's theological views were, broady speaking, those of the Tractarians, he was not primarily concerned with the adaptation of the cathedral tradition to new forms of worship, and he was not anxious to revive ancient liturgical music. His foundation was essentially conservative, and no doubt, like S. S. Wesley and most of the musicians of the time, he shared Mendelssohn's view that advance must be along the lines of the accepted harmonic system. The choral Mattins and Evensong of the cathedral tradition was all that the statutes of St. Michael's laid down as of daily obligation, and it was into these principles, illuminated by the sacramental teaching of a devout and enlightened mind, that he initiated his scholars, and with them his young organist. Stainer after three years obtained the responsible post of organist at Magdalen, Oxford, and thanks

to Ouseley's influence entered as an undergraduate at St. Edmund's Hall, from which he graduated B.A. in 1863. A decade later, when he succeeded Sir John Goss as organist of St. Paul's Cathedral where he had begun his musical career as a chorister, he was fully equipped to reorganize the musical establishment there on lines which would enable it to provide a fitting counterpart to such preaching as that of Liddon.

The service at St. Paul's, at which the weekly choral Eucharist was sung and the daily Offices were reverently performed by a competent choir, consolidated the ground won by the first forty years of the Oxford Movement. Stainer's part in this was creditable alike to his musicianship and his churchmanship. His interest in the development of parochial church music was very keen, and he set himself the task of composing music, anthems, and services within the capacity of parochial church choirs of the larger kind. Like all music written to supply a felt want, his compositions were not free from the taint of "writing down," and some of his worst productions became, and still remain, regrettably popular. But the settings of the Office of Holy Communion are not to be condemned with the cantata *The Crucifixion*, or such an anthem as "They have taken away my Lord." Though the music attains no very high level of inspiration it is a generally expressive, and for the most part a reverent, handling of the sacred text, avoiding over-elaborateness. Above all, it is the music of one who realizes that the celebration of Holy Communion is not just "a service" like any other. The same may be said of Garrett, who, as a pupil of S. S. Wesley, had inherited naturally much of Wesley's musical language. His several services included the music of the Communion with the Morning and Evening Canticles, and in some instances provided for the singing of the *Agnus Dei* and *Benedictus*. That in itself attests that Garrett was not thinking primarily of a sung Communion in the Cathedrals from which the congregations were wont to evaporate after the prayer for the Church Militant. His Communion Service in E flat, indeed, was one of those which set the fashion of writing harmonized music to portions of the Liturgy, which it is now realized are better left to the traditional Plainsong. It includes two settings of Responses to the Commandments (*Kyrie*), *Gloria Tibi* and *Gratias Tibi* (before and after the Gospel), Creed, Offertory Sentence, *Sursum Corda*, *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, *Agnus*, and *Gloria in Excelsis*.

The works of Stainer, Garrett, and their contemporaries are open to criticism on several counts, liturgical and artistic, but they were an important factor in the spread of Eucharistic worship through the Anglican Communion. Briefly, they enabled ordinary congregations to feel the sung Eucharist to be

a homely act of corporate devotion. They supplied music of the same kind as that which these congregations were used to in other services, but with a special intention. The sense of strangeness both in ceremonial and music has probably kept more people away from the Catholic Revival in the English Church than the fear of "popery." Plainsong, on the one hand, and adapted Viennese and French masses on the other, were strange; Stainer and Garrett were comfortably English. Their music essentially belongs to that standard of ceremonial which includes altar lights, the eastward position, and a priest wearing a coloured stole, with or without a linen vestment (which, after all, looks very like a surplice !).

Contemporary with this type of service music came the consolidation of the position in regard to hymns, due to the widespread though quite unofficial acceptance of the revised and enlarged edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1875) as the hymnal of the English Church. In his scholarly introduction to the historical edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1904), Dr. W. H. Frere has described the evolution of English hymnody from the seventeenth century onwards as divided into three stages:

> "In the first stage the [metrical] Psalms hold the field, but a few hymns are tolerated in an appendix. In the second the Psalms have still a priority; but only selected Psalms are utilized, and with them the hymns take a place on fairly equal terms. In the last the hymns hold the field; and such Psalm versions as are included figure among the hymns in a scheme of arrangement which is wholly unconnected with the Psalter and is more and more conformed to that of the Prayer Book."

This last stage begins from the birth of the Oxford Movement, is first illustrated in Bishop Heber's collection, and naturally gathered strength through the century, in which the order of the Christian year was regaining its hold on the imagination of church worshippers. The Oxford Movement found its poets, headed by Keble himself, more readily than it found its musicians, and its hymn literature was steadily enriched with original compositions and translations, more especially of the ancient Latin Office hymns. J. M. Neale's *Hymnal Noted* (1852) was the pioneer work in this latter direction. The new and comprehensive book, projected at a meeting held at St. Barnabas, Pimlico, in 1857, was from the first intended to represent the mind of the English Church, not to illustrate the tenets of a party or to adopt any esoteric views on artistic matters. The inspiration of the title seems to have come from its musical editor, Dr. W. H. Monk. After a preliminary issue for temporary use, *Hymns Ancient and Modern* made its first appearance as a collection of 273 hymns in 1861, with music which contained

only just enough which could be described as "ancient" to make the title appropriate to it as well as to the words. The Rev. Sir Henry Williams Baker presided over the editorial committee; though Monk was the working musical editor, he had Ouseley behind him as adviser. Both Ouseley and Monk contributed new tunes of permanent value, and the latter is responsible for at least one tune ("Eventide"), which, as a setting of Lyle's "Abide with me," is now on the lips of every singer of English hymns the world over.

But the composer whose name stands out as the typical representative of the new tunes of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* is the Rev. J. B. Dykes, who contributed seven to the first edition and many more to later ones. The fact that now, more than fifty years after his death, the purists of music are still shooting out their tongues at "the Dykes hymn tune," and for the most part shooting them in vain, is proof positive of his power over the hearts of men. Few of his tunes rise to the simple majesty of his "Nicæa," now the inevitable musical counterpart of Heber's "Holy, Holy, Holy"; the sweetness of "St. Cuthbert," sung to Harriet Auber's "Our blest Redeemer," is apt to cloy, but with "St. Cross" Dykes gave a setting to Faber's "O come and mourn" which is pathetic without loss of dignity. In these and many others it was his virtue to catch so instinctively the mood of the words that strength or weakness in the melody often seems to be the outcome of those qualities in the poet rather than in the musician. Dykes had his complete failures and they have now fallen into disuse; his partial failures were sometimes the result of an imperfect handling of an original idea. Amongst these must be counted his tune to "Lead, kindly Light," despite its great popularity, and Cardinal Newman's own assertion that it was the tune rather than the words which gained that popularity. The tune halts badly in the third line, the melody of which would be bald in the extreme without its backing of harmony.

A very general characteristic of the hymn tunes promulgated by *Hymns Ancient and Modern* in its earlier editions is their dependence on four-part harmony. They are written primarily for the choir, by that time surpliced and firmly ensconced in the chancel of nearly every parish church in the kingdom. Dykes and Monk at their best kept the melodic line clear of harmonic implications, but apart from their best one finds in them and their contemporaries an increasing tendency to make the interest of the composition depend on the movement of inner parts, while the tune stands still and the bass becomes a clumsy makeshift. "Eventide" itself truckles to the village tenor and Dyke's "St. Andrew of Crete," written

for Neale's "Christian, dost thou see them?" carries the process to the point of banality. Stainer was one of the worst offenders in the production of the part-song type of hymn tune, and his setting of "The roseate hues" exposes every evil inherent in the tendency.

In the part-song hymn the tune is apt to be forced too high for the congregation, who must leave F sharps to the trained head-notes of choirboys, while, if it is transposed to a lower pitch, the basses are out of their depth and the aspiring tenor is robbed of his pleasure. A reaction against the part-song hymn and against four-part harmony as the basis of all Church music was bound to come, but it did not come quickly, and even now it has not come fully.

Stainer and Garrett, Dykes and Monk, established the types of essentially Anglican Church music which prevailed through the generation which succeeded them. Even such dominating personalities and able composers as Hubert Parry and C. V. Stanford largely accepted their conventions when they wrote for the English Church. Compare with Stainer's "The roseate hues," Parry's tune, "Amberley," which he wrote for the same hymn for the 1904 revision of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*.

In regard to the ecclesiastical outlook engendered by the Oxford Movement the position of Parry and Stanford is curious, considering their antecedents. Hubert Parry was nurtured in it and revolted. His father, Gambier Parry, owner of Highnam Court, amateur of the arts and painter of the frescoes which adorn the lantern of Ely Cathedral, was a devout layman of the school of Ouseley. The Protestantism of Stanford's Dublin upbringing was not modified by the more cosmopolitan experiences of his later life, yet he, taking a more objective view of his art than was Parry's, enriched the repertory of Anglican music with a quantity of fine liturgical music. "Stanford in B flat" may be described as developing the type of Garrett's services to a finer artistic issue. There is a passage in Parry's early diary in which he confesses to a sense of shock at being required to take part in a choral Eucharist in Highnam Church, and while the lofty idealism of his genuinely religious nature found expression in anthems, motets, and the noble cantatas which he wrote for Three Choirs' Festivals, he could never after his early years bring his art more directly to the service of the Church or himself enter into the sacramental side of its worship. He never wrote a mass.

After Stanford came Charles Wood, another Irishman of similar temperament, but of a more retiring nature, and as regards Church music a man of deeper insight, who profited by the new scholarship in the arts of Plainsong and mediæval

polyphony so greatly advanced in the later years of the nineteenth century. "Wood in the Phrygian Mode" may be taken as the type of the musician's contribution to Anglo-Catholic worship in the twentieth century. In it and innumerable other services Wood, greatly influenced by his friend, the Rev. G. R. Woodward, compiler of *Songs of Syon*, shows himself drawn to a realization of the historic continuity of the Church today with that Ecclesia Anglicana which developed its liturgy and its art side by side and independently of continental influence before the rupture of the sixteenth century. The importance of Charles Wood as the creator of a new type of Anglican Church music having its roots in tradition, but nourished by the free air of modern religious life, is still too little realized.

Recent events in this century of development begun in 1833 can be here only briefly touched on. "The Plainsong and Mediæval Music Society," founded in 1888 by a group of prominent churchmen to be a centre of information in England and a means of communication with students in other countries, soon became, and still is, a valuable asset. Sir Richard Terry's practical revival at the new Roman Catholic Cathedral at Westminster of the old English polyphonic composers led to the Carnegie Trust's publication of *Tudor Church Music* (ten volumes), which engaged the scholarship of such men as Professor Percy Buck and Dr. E. H. Fellowes. The latter especially enriched the repertory through the popular edition of Tudor works undertaken by the Oxford University Press.

Meantime the question of a reformation in popular hymnody was raised by the publication in 1904 of a much purged edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*; but reformation is harder to achieve than revolution, and while this effort fell flat the appearance of the *English Hymnal* soon after, an admirable book which drew largely on the experience gained by its predecessor, secured the adherence of the more liberal-minded churchmen. Personal efforts such as those of Mr. Royle Shore to inculcate the desirability of restoring the "people's part" in singing the Mass, and such contrasted examples in London churches as the popular Plainsong of St. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square, the Merbecke of Grosvenor Chapel, and the "Folk Mass" which Mr. Martin Shaw wrote for St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, have had their effects in breaking through the tyranny of four-part harmony and renewing the sense of personal responsibility of the congregation in the Eucharistic act.

Early in the century the Church Music Society was founded at the instance of Lady Mary Trefusis to exercise a co-ordinating influence, and to offer guidance to parochial clergy and church musicians, who amongst all the conflicting propaganda

were asking "What must we do?" The society was fortunate in securing the assistance of many eminent musicians, clerical as well as lay, and it began with a modest attempt to sift wheat from chaff, to place samples of the wheat before its members, and to persuade them that there are principles by which they may attain sufficient experience to do the sifting for themselves. The society's work led to the appointment in 1922 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York of a Committee—

"To consider and report upon the place of music in the worship of the Church, and in particular the training of Church musicians and the education of the clergy in the knowledge of music as a branch of liturgical Study."

It was directly as a result of the Committee's report on "Music in Worship" that Dr. Sydney Nicholson, then chairman of the Church Music Society and organist of Westminster Abbey, left the latter distinguished position to form the School of English Church Music which is now spreading its influence throughout the country from its headquarters, the College of St. Nicolas at Chislehurst, and which is gathering 4,000 of its members together at the Crystal Palace on July 21.

The School of English Church Music is for the furtherance of the art of Church music as a whole, not for the propagation of any theory of perfection. It is not to be claimed as the product of Anglo-Catholicism in any party sense, but without the renewed sense of the character of Catholic worship which the century has brought, such an organization would be unthinkable, and such work as proceeds from St. Nicolas College would be meaningless.

It is now realized that church music is not an independent art to be practised in isolation, an "art for art's sake," as the cant phrase goes. Rather, music is seen to be the partial expression of an idea to which liturgy and ceremonial also make their contribution. The music of the Church must be in keeping with the kind of liturgy in use and the ceremonial practised. The musician must find his right place in the participation. He must not say: "Bach's cantatas are good music; therefore we will sing them as anthems at Evensong, truncating the service as far as may be necessary." He will not say that if his education has begun with a realization of the structural balance of the Office of Evensong. The idea underlying the service comes first, be it Sacrament or Choir Office, and the artistic elements must be disposed so as to present the idea fully and fitly. That is good art (as Wagner showed in the theatre) and good Catholicism too, and because it is both, the renewed life of church music in England has through the last century been bound up with the progress of the Catholic Revival.

H. C. COLLES.

ARCHITECTURE AND ART OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

"ECCLESIOLOGY," replied *Palæophilus* to the mundane and utilitarian *Practicus*—

"is a different thing from mere Church architecture, as embracing both it and all its collateral branches of information as to Church history and antiquities. Cicero, you know, says that it is next to impossible that a perfect orator should arise, because one that is so must have some knowledge of all arts and sciences whatever. And so it is with the Ecclesiologist. First, he must be well versed in history, especially Church history; antiquities, of course, are a part of his study; of masonry and carpentry he should have some idea; music, so far as ecclesiastical compositions are concerned, comes within what he requires; he must be able to draw; mechanics also are necessary; something of geology he should know, to supply information respecting building stones; the glazier's art is by no means below him; with embroidery, tapestry, and the like, he has much to do; of the goldsmith's craft he should know something, for the precious metals used in a church; of the potter's, for encaustic tiles; some knowledge of the value of labour and the price of materials is very proper; some acquaintance with sculpture is desirable; mathematics are, to a certain degree, necessary for the compilations of the calendar; and, after all, these things will be of little avail by themselves. As Cicero says that none but a good man can be a good orator, much more may I say so of the Ecclesiologist. . . ."*

Thus the indefatigable Neale, prophet and priest of the Oxford Revival in all that concerns ecclesiastical art. In Oxford the movement spelt theology, morals, prayer; in Cambridge architectural, antiquarian, musical, decorative and symbolistic passion. We smile at the Victorian oddity of *Hierologus*, but feel the power of its rapture in discovery and fervour for the beauties of religion to which maltreated church and ruined abbey witnessed with dying voices throughout England. To the Tractarian movement Cambridge contributed little; to the "Ritualistic," which carried it to the people, much. It was the Camden Society, inspired and driven above all by Neale, which bound the Romantic and the Oxford Movements together, and fused an emotional and (except for Pugin) ignorant Gothic Revival with the resurrection of a Church. An architectural fashion was thus stiffened and empowered with the scholarship, the principle, the definite purpose and the ardour of a religious awakening.

"After 1840 the movements are almost identical."† (Neale and Benjamin Webb founded the Cambridge Camden Society in 1839.)

* *Hierologus: a Church Tour through England and Wales*, J. M. Neale, p. 189.

† Clark, *The Gothic Revival*, p. 193.

"Fashion and economy had led to Gothic being applied to ecclesiastical architecture, but the connection was too superficial to have survived practical difficulties. Courageous efforts to build a truly Protestant church in the Gothic style were made as late as 1837. Had Anglican requirements remained unaltered, Gothic would have been abandoned as a style for churches, and the Gothic Revival would have died with the death of Beckfordian romanticism. But the Tractarians wished to revive old ritual, and to do so they required churches in which it could be accurately performed—churches with altars and deep chancels; moreover, they wished to move the imagination through symbols, and for this they required the sculpture and architecture of the church to be rich in symbolical device. In short, they wanted a true Gothic church."*

So writes the latest historian of the Gothic Revival, tracing in a brilliant chapter the manner in which "the pietistic archæological society of a University" came to have "a very great influence on architecture." We are far from the modern slogan "art for art's sake." The Ecclesiologists stressed "art for religion's sake" so strongly that they did not shrink from maintaining, as the quotation from *Hierologus* shows, that only good men could build good churches! They married ethics and art for the perfecting of each. And the event provided apparent proof to the theory. Amongst all distinguished groups of professional men, none by their lives deserve the gratitude of their mother Church nor the respect of all men better than the band of the great Gothic Revival architects of the latter part of the nineteenth century. To the value of their artistic achievement we shall come presently.

The conviction, amounting to religious faith, the architectural doctrine, amounting to intolerance, of the Camdenists won their battle at the first rush. They preached to a Church whose standards of beauty were even lower than those of religion, and converted it. For four decisive years architecture and Protestantism alike were too dumbfounded to protest. Then neither measured its terms of abuse. Weale's *Quarterly* "on the score of professional chivalry" broke "a lance with that grand High Church champion" thus:†

"The matter, *architecturally* not less than *spiritually*, seems to have originated with certain '*clerkes* of OXEN FORDE.' As the tracts theological, so have the treatises churchgothical swarmed upon us; till a public, hitherto ignorant of architecture *in any variety whatever*, is now crammed to suffocation with a spurious knowledge of it *in one variety alone*. An eleventh commandment seems to have issued from heaven itself declaring 'thou shalt not worship the grandeur of Egypt, nor the beauty of Greece, nor the grandeur of Rome, nor the romantic delicacy of Mohammedanism,

* *Ibid.*, p. 199.

† Quoted from Clark, *Gothic Revival*, 214 *sq.*, the italics and capitals transcribed from the originals.

nor the plastic varieties of Italy, but thou shalt worship only GOTHICISM! Through its mysterious vistas and lengthened arcades alone shalt thou hope to reach the high altar of Christ!'

"Impotent incipiency of a bastard superstition! Hopeless tyranny of English Church parsondom, seeking, under the banners of architecture, to revive, not the power of the Pope, but the power of Popery in its own body! Sad acknowledgment of a want of vitality in Church of Englandism, of utter despair in its originative influence on the noble art of architecture!"

The fury of the architect, however, was outdone by that of the preacher. Dr. Close's sermon on November 5, 1844, killed the Camden Society, though it rose again unabashed under a new name. As Mr. Clark says: "Dr. Close's sustained emotion—he employs, I venture to think, more italics than any other author of the century—and the even richness of his language, make quotation difficult." The disconnected fragments which follow give little idea of the style of the whole.

"It will be my object to show that as Romanism is taught *analytically* at Oxford, it is taught *artistically* at Cambridge—that it is inculcated theoretically at one University, and it is *sculptured, painted and graven* at the other.

"In a word the *Ecclesiologist* of Cambridge is identical in doctrine with the Oxford *Tracts for the Times*.

"It is not a question of brick and stone, of taste or of science—the points at issue are purely doctrinal: it is whether Romanism or Protestantism shall prevail.

"But enough of such sickening details; enough to establish beyond controversy that *such restoration* of churches *not only tends to*, but *actually is POPERY*."*

The Camdenists in the result did more damage to our ancient churches than this later age cares to remember; their damnation of "perpendicular" Gothic as "debased" doomed new ones to the death of cold (and incorrect) "correctness" or sham prettiness. But it captured the Englishman's religious imagination, "and for fifty years almost every new Anglican church was built and furnished according to their instructions; that is to say, in a manner opposed to utility, economy or good sense—a very wonderful achievement in the mid-nineteenth century."†

There is another side to the picture. The Camdenists did directly beget a race of architects, beginning with Butterfield, who were far more than copyists, and whose works are of a beauty or grandeur that will endure. We do not count among them Sir Gilbert Scott, the supreme popularizer of the style which, despite a few stately churches, he imitated without imagination. Nor Carpenter, nor Street, its best grammarians.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 215-216. † *Ibid.*, p. 226.

Nor even James Brooks, though he contributed noble brick masses and continental details to the revival in a series of Anglo-Catholic churches built from his heart. But Butterfield, Pearson, Bodley, Scott II. and Micklethwaite are men who, though conforming *ex animo* to the Gothic canon, wielded the style with an originality, fineness and power which redeemed and justified the Camdenist enthusiasm. Sedding and Norman Shaw went further in breaking through stylistic bonds. The pupils and successors of these great names—Temple Moore, Comper, Tapper, Johnson, and Scott III.—handle Gothic (when they like to do so) with complete mastery and freedom. It is impossible to follow the story further into the details of the reaction against Gothic, though here too it is the Catholic movement which is the passionate pioneer of the Church glorious.

After all, it was only to be expected that, to begin with, a Catholic Revival should express itself in England along the lines of its traditional Catholic architecture. The critics who complain of churches built correctly for the ritual of 500 years ago, and not for the benefit of the spoken word, show little knowledge of the Catholic religion. Where English religion is of the pulpit, it gets the building it wants, and spoils city and village alike with its chapels. The worship of the historic Church does not change so radically even in half a thousand years. And the profoundest effect of the Oxford Movement in this sphere lies, not in its own architectural creations, but in the ability to use properly once again our legion of ancient churches.

Nevertheless, in celebrating the saints and servants of the Oxford Revival, we must give its architects and artists their individual meed of praise. And first, Butterfield. Name of endless conflict! Yet if we quarrel with his taste, we cannot with his genius; he was captain of many revolutions. He had architectural imagination of the boldest sort. He aimed fiercely at noble and novel proportion; no slave to rule of thumb, he. Look at the splendid mass of Keble College Chapel (1867), and the loftiness, then so new, of All Saints, Margaret Street (1849), and St. Alban's, Holborn (1858). He introduced forms virtually new to England—look at the saddleback tower of St. Mathias, Stoke Newington (1850), the gabled belfry of St. Alban's, the tower and spire of All Saints. He built unashamedly in brick. He employed colour, without and within, immoderately, crudely if you like, but with a grand daring. He had his vision for every square foot of the building, whether for glass, or mosaic, or mural decoration, or single brick. His furniture is often, his woodwork always, awful. As Byron with wild and restless genius followed the eighteenth century poets, so Butterfield the nineteenth century church architects. "In estimating the

value of his work," wrote Eastlake,* " posterity may find something to smile at as eccentric, something to deplore as ill-judged, and much that will astonish as daring; but they will find nothing to despise as commonplace or mean."

A typical "Pearson" church is a thing wholly *sui generis*. Learn any one—*e.g.*, St. Alban's, Birmingham; and, despite the variety of the many others, you know their authorship at a glance. For many years of a long career he was but a decent Gothic grammarian. In 1863 he suddenly let himself go with the fine church of St. Peter's, Vauxhall. Only once afterwards did he revert to the grammarian—in his Cathedral at Truro; and then with a ludicrous completeness which was the death-knell of grammar, but which yet showed a marvel, that grammar can be exceedingly lovely.

What, then, did the "Pearson type" give us? First, churches that soar: more than any other in modern times do they take away the breath of them who enter. His vision of proportion sought height, and he crowned all with a roof vaulted in stone. Here, in modern days, he has been pioneer with no followers, save Bodley on occasions. But it gives his buildings a monumental effect. His apparent style is almost always thirteenth century. With Pearson alone of Gothic revivalists does it succeed; because, of course, it is not really thirteenth century, but Pearson. He has a lancet window of his own proportions all but universal in his churches. It may derive from Lincoln, but on one else has found it. He avoids the central tower, and his transepts, when they exist, do not usually increase the width of the ground plan. He never made a mistake with towers and spires, witness St. Augustine's, Kilburn. None but he, again, has been able to naturalize the apse. Gilbert Scott could not do it—his looks pinchbecked and Frenchy; Street could not—his looks mean and stupid. All the other masters avoided it; the minor men rushed at it with excruciating results. Pearson succeeded. His are the only truly English apses in existence. But he grew to love them less and less, and reverted to the square end with fine compositions of grouped lancets. His internal arrangements raised standards in all directions. He constructed processional paths round the choir; his chapels are real chapels, not some odd corner of wall space. Although his stone or iron screens, his gorgeous marble pavements, his huge triptychs over the altar, have gone out of fashion, they exactly suit his interiors, and here again (with Bodley) he is the first to insist that the design of the furniture is an integral part of the architect's task.

* *Cf.* Bodley's comment on Butterfield, "The only modern architect I can really respect"; and Comper's "St. Alban's and All Saints rank in their own right alongside of the achievements of former ages."

Visit St. Stephen's, Bournemouth, or St. John's, Upper Norwood, or many another, and, above all, the magnificent and daringly unconventional St. Augustine's, Kilburn, and it is impossible not to acclaim them as the work of genius. Nothing in Christendom much resembles them: they are a stylistic subspecies of their own, solemn and splendid; yet, inasmuch as they gather up inheritances of the past, they are not new, but Catholic.

The last sentence might be written also over Bodley's work. But his genius flowered into charm rather than splendour. He is the poet of the architects of the Revival. Far more various in conception and plan than Pearson's, his churches have all a gracefulness and graciousness which marry repose and devotion from the moment of their birth. If it be that the artist conveys his own spirit to his creations, Bodley's has been recorded in a hundred memorials as of singular beauty. In no Gothic "style" has he failed to erect something that is flawless. Town church or country church, cheap church or costly, each is perfect.* Grace does not imply weakness or femininity with him. He could emphasize grandeur, as in St. Augustine's, Pendlebury; or virility, as in St. German's, Roath, and St. Mary of Eton; or austere chastity, as in St. Michael's, Camden Town; or all these combined, as in Hoar Cross.

With Bodley can be coupled Micklethwaite, less remembered because his works are rarer.† He wrote a valuable treatise called *Modern Parish Churches*, as hard to come by as his churches. With these two architects the waste of fussy carvings and antiquarian ornament passed for ever away. As keen upon the smallest detail of furniture as upon plan and proportion, they innovated in two ways exceedingly fruitful for interiors. They reintroduced the open choir screen of carved wood; and the element of colour in painting roofs, walls and furniture; in the provision of rich stuffs for frontals and dossals; in revolutionizing the standards and employment of stained glass. But to these allied arts we must recur later.

The two Southwark churches of Gilbert Scott II.—greatest of his line and name, whose early death robbed England of a master of first rank—All Hallows and St. Agnes, Kennington, of a later Gothic than an older England ever knew, pave the way to a group of a less conservative, more experimental manner. All the churches of Norman Shaw are interesting and unpleasing. Each is a violent revolt against grammarian Gothic, but the revolt of the architect rather than of the churchman. They

* Garner, Bodley's partner in his finest series of churches, must be given the meed of a great collaborator.

† *Cf.* Stretton Church, Burton; St. Martin, Brighton; St. Hilda, Leeds; St. Matthew, Southsea; and two at Wimbledon.

lack devotional atmosphere, and are ill-planned for practical use. With Shaw the search for the right contemporary expression of a religious building ends in an architectural exercise rather than a church*—only less a fault than correct copyism of the past. Sedding succeeded where Shaw failed. At St. Clement, Boscombe, he supplied the missing link between flowing and perpendicular Gothic; at Holy Trinity, Sloane Square, that between Tudor and Renaissance; with the Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell, he showed the way, so well-peopled since, to the modern Renaissance town church. With his wealth of fancy and the passion of his ideals, Sedding is not the least among this great generation of church-builders.

Of the next generation, nearer to ourselves, it is harder to speak. But giants are always visible, and they made the modern Anglican church at its best, so far as beauty is concerned, the loveliest in Christendom. Temple Moore, pupil of Scott II., carried on the middle Gothic tradition of Bodley with a fresh grace and freedom. His smaller churches, such as St. Augustine's, Gillingham, Kent,† are to my mind finer in quality than the more famous St. Wilfrid's, Harrogate. Comper not only revealed again both the suitability and the airy poetry of Perpendicular, as in St. Cyprian's, Dorset Square, and the superb St. Mary's, Wellingborough, but taught us again to appreciate and love the English classicalism deriving from Restoration and early Georgian days.‡ There is no "copyism" about these two masters.‖ Learning, reverence for the past, understanding of the present, and exquisite taste combine for both beauty and fitness.

Handling Gothic forms with similar freedom are Tapper and Sir Giles Gilbert Scott (III.). Every work, whether for the Church of England or of Rome, of the latter marks fresh thought upon the planning of a church; his architecture, therefore,

* *Cf.* St. Michael's, Chiswick, and St. Mark's, Walworth ("Queen Anne Gothic"!); Holy Trinity, Latimer Road, N.; St. Margaret's, Ilkley; St. Michael's, Bournemouth; All Saints, Leek.

† And many others at Bradford, Leeds, Scarborough, Basingstoke, etc.

‡ *Cf.* St. Mary's, Rochdale, and Wimborne St. Giles.

‖ *Cf.* Comper's own description of his Wellingborough Church: "St. Mary's would doubtless in common parlance be called Perpendicular," yet "the whole church betrays that it could not have been built at any other time than our own. The main ceiling has the unbroken fan and pendants of the latest English vaults, which, so far as I am aware, have not been combined before. The octagonal pillars (again, I believe, unlike all mediæval examples) have the Greek entasis, and they have the same detail of flutes as the Parthenon, while the capitals and bases are of new design. A baldachino stands in advance of the east wall and in front of the large window, the high chancel screen has mouldings and acanthus straight from classic Greece, and a general design which is as much Italian as English, or English as Italian. The dragons on the rood loft are borrowed from mediæval Greece, while the ironwork owes most to Spain. It may be added that the main plan of the east part of the church has its origin in France. Only to its contemporaries does the church owe nothing." Such eclecticism sounds terrible! But the whole is an original, a unified and a Catholic masterpiece.

has an intellectual quality which is bracing, but it tends to overpower the devotional. He has effected for modern Gothic what Bentley effected for modern Basilican. To the swing-over by architects and priests (rather than by the laity) to non-Gothic idioms for town churches we can do no more than refer. It would seem a bewildering phase, until we remember that what we call "style" in architecture is little more than "fashion": there is nothing so mediæval or modern or eternal as change of taste! With the tremendous exception of Westminster Cathedral, it still remains true that the larger experiments in these other "fashions" are made by Anglo-Catholics,* in that the Catholic Revival has given the whole Church the new mind and approach which has made them possible and desired.

It is time, however, to leave pure architecture, and go to those other arts for which the decoration and furnishing of a church call. Yet, since Architecture in no other sphere so plainly takes her proper place as the Mistress of the Arts, we do not leave the architects who have shepherded such developments. The Camdenists paid much attention to interior detail. They loved encaustic tiles, brazen rails and correct carving in stone and wood. They fathered the revival of glass-painting, and a thousand churches have yet to recover from the baleful glare of three disastrous "W's"—Willement, Warrington and Wailes. Who, of course, had yet worse imitators. The debt to Clayton and Bell for raising gradually the whole standard of design, colour and "period stylism" has been insufficiently acknowledged. Their practice was so vast that necessarily much of it is dull and inferior. Yet their purest "fifteenth century" phase is everywhere pleasant to the eye; a number of single windows, such as the west window in the Temple Church, Bristol, and in King's College Chapel, and a few churchfuls, Truro Cathedral in particular, reach high levels.

The decisive moment, however, for the artistic side of the Revival arrived when it effected a junction with the Pre-Raphaelites. To no single man was this more due than Bodley. To quote from Professor Simpson's obituary notice of him in the *Journal of the R.I.B.A.*:†

"He obtained for Burne-Jones his first commission . . . to point a triptych for Wagner's Church of St. Paul, Brighton. . . . In the west windows of St. Michael's, Brighton, and in the Staveley End Church can be seen some of the earliest of Morris's glass in the kingdom, the cartoons

---

* *Cf.* St. Bartholomew's, Brighton (1868, Edmund Scott); St. Aidan's, Leeds (1892, R. S. Johnson); the series of Basilican churches in Portsmouth; the two Italianesque churches in Bournemouth, St. Osmund (1911, Prior), and St. Francis (1930, Gibbons); and the lovely St. Augustine's, Wembley (1927, Lyon).

† Vol. XV. January 11, 1908.

for the latter being made by Ford Madox Brown, Rossetti and Morris. St. Martin's, Scarborough, is an epitome of the union of the arts. The central panel on the east wall is by Burne-Jones, the side-panels are by Morris. The painting of the organ-case is by Spencer Stanhope. The chancel roof was decorated by Morris, assisted by Philip Webb, Bodley himself executing the painting over the chancel arch. Morris drew the cartoons for the paintings in the lower panels of the pulpit, a side-panel being painted by Rossetti. All the windows are filled with stained glass, the early ones being made by Morris from cartoons by Burne-Jones, Ford Madox Brown, Rossetti and Webb. The decorations of All Saints, Cambridge, and St. John's, Tue Brook (Liverpool), are by C. E. Kempe, the latter church having the wonderful Tree of Jesse covering the whole of the west wall above the low archway into the tower. What a list of collaborators! . . ."

He started, with Gilbert Scott II., Watts and Co. in Baker Street. "In the seventies Morris's and Watts's, very different in their ideals, were almost the only places in London where really fine hangings, wall-papers, etc., could be bought." Later in life he tended to put his work into the hands of firms—*e.g.*, his glass he gave to Burlison and Grylls; but in all his own works he seemed able to exalt them to his own merit. Perhaps because Garner prepared to smallest detail the designs.

Pre-Raphaelite art has lost its popularity; but its alliance with Anglo-Catholicism had decisive results. It gave the Church both standard and vision of beauty: glass-painting, in particular, found its new and modern form. Such windows as those in Jesus College Chapel, Cambridge, and Christchurch Cathedral, Oxford, by Burne-Jones, caught hold of an art reviving painfully and crudely, and exalted it to the height of achievement in a moment. The true Pre-Raphaelite succession has descended, not by pictorial art, but by stained glass—descended directly in three wholly diverse streams. The first is that of the firms of Morris, and of Powell of Whitefriars. The former carried imitation of its creators to caricature; the latter, whose work can be seen in most cathedrals, including Liverpool, employed the Burne-Jones idiom with more respect for the nature of glass, and with developing freedom in design. With these may be grouped the more individual works of the painter Holliday.

The other two streams are of higher importance, and of great originality. Kempe's gift to the Church and to art has not been sufficiently prized owing to its very success. The multitude of orders quickly turned a great artist into a firm, which, none the less, he so guided and ruled that scarcely a window out of a thousand is ill-conceived or mean, and none fails in sparkling brilliance of colour. Two months ago two of us spent a week wandering by car at random across England

merely to look at modern glass. It was a revelation of the power and supremacy of Kempe. The variety and boldness of his design stood out with startling strength over against all competitors, and quite swallowed up the criticism so often levelled at the conventionality of his faces. In no instance that we saw did his taste fail; in many—in the Church of West Kirby, and in Lichfield Cathedral, for instance—the imagination and delicacy of design, and the richness of the colour scheme was extraordinary. He created a school of glass, uniquely splendid in a way comprehensible to all, to which pupils such as Bryans (now dead) and Tower have succeeded.

The revolt of the studio against the manufacturing firm found a gay captain in Christopher Whall, whose book on the craft, *Stained Glass Work*, is a classic of humour and sound sense. In his hands the Pre-Raphaelite inspiration took on a wholly new form, which can best be studied in the Lady Chapel of Gloucester Cathedral. The men and women trained by him form a school of individual artists. Louis Davis, in particular, excelled his master, and in turn inspired the Scot, David Strachan. Strachan's glass can be seen at its best in St. Paul's Cathedral, and at Winchelsea. It lacks the tender devotional feeling of Davis's work; but for stark strength and for individual passages of extreme beauty, the Winchelsea glass is astonishing. So, in the country of art, the Oxford Movement has inspired, and received gifts back from, the Presbyterian.

But these three great streams from the Pre-Raphaelite spring do not exclude other rivers of beauty. Old glass of the fifteenth and sixteenth century has been no less a source of inspiration. It has, indeed, influenced the craftsmen of whom we have been speaking, as the prime of the past must always do. But upon such sure foundation has J. N. Comper built more completely in glass which combines delicacy of taste, purity of drawing and colour, and devotional depth with the certainty of genius. Though there is old glass in Evreux Cathedral before which one might easily cry out "Comper," yet there is no antiquarianism about his work. To use an inadequate expression, he has modernized the real mediæval spirit at its truest and best, as the school of Whall has modernized Pre-Raphaelitism—which is only an imaginative mediævalism. And since his source is purer, his art is purer and stronger. And it has invaded and conquered every other territory of decoration. His sense of colour is exquisite. Continental influences upon ceremonial and ornament have inevitably been powerful in the later developments of the Oxford Movement. In the field of ceremonial, the issue hangs still in the balance; in that of ornament, the sheer beauty of Comper's work has already won the battle.

The "Comper Altar" (which is no more "English," according to the popular notion, than it is Flemish or French), with its great length, riddel posts, and rich hangings, has not only enhanced the dignity of the Anglican sanctuary, but has made its way into the Roman, both at home and abroad. Yet, as in architecture and glass, so here, Comper is no "mediævalist." He handles, and eagerly, Renaissance and classical forms with no less boldness and simplicity. Everything, indeed, that he touches becomes lovely. No one has so sensitively understood a church, or been able to express in the outward things the loveliness of its purpose.*

The Englishman prefers to paint on light in his large windows rather than upon dark and often damp walls. Purely pictorial, or even sculptured art, has not yet found itself at home in English churches, despite a large use of Arundel and Medici prints. Reredoses from Oberammergau, and copies of old Italian Madonnas, declare our desire of beauty without contributing seriously to it. Modern painting and sculpture seem so individualistic and so far from finding a spiritual expression that we do not trust them in our churches, and prefer pietistic Christmas-cardy representation of figures and sacred scenes of less than no artistic value. Truro Cathedral provides an exception in a painting of Cornish industries bringing their gifts to Christ over a side-altar. Exceptionally, and above all, Father Walke of St. Hilary, Marazion, has shown the way to the right use of pictorial art in church. In other ways, too, he has transformed, by taste and not by wealth, a feeble church of the Gothic Revival into a miracle of beauty—just the task which needs doing in a thousand churches. Not a church in England but can learn from St. Hilary; and we have allowed Mr. Kensit to stone the prophet and defile the holy place with axes and hammers.†

The alliance, on the other hand, of music and the Church, hampered in the nineteenth century by Victorian sentimentality, has now been re-cemented by a return to austerer ideals in three ways: by the serious study of Plainsong, by the recovery and revival of the works of Tudor polyphony, and by the readiness of the newer schools of composers, fathered by Stanford, Parry and Charles Wood, to write for the Church. But this demands a paper in itself; here it can be but alluded to for completeness'

* *Cf.* his papers before the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, *Practical Considerations on the Gothic or English Altar and Certain Dependent Ornaments*, 1894, and *Further Thoughts on . . .* (its continuation), 1933.

† In so short a paper, design of altar-cross, plate, and metal-work generally cannot be touched, except, out of gratitude, to record the exquisite talent of Bainbridge Reynolds; nor of woodwork, where many excellent things, such as the splendid screen of Blisland, by Eden, redeem more that are feeble.

sake. The rebirth of the glory of worship which has called forth this musical renaissance is the work of the Tractarian Revival, which here again has passed far beyond Anglo-Catholic boundaries, and now possesses most of the cathedrals.

So, in the sphere of loveliness, God has been relearned and honoured by the Oxford Movement. When a single county like Cornwall, besides a new Cathedral, can display sanctuaries of such extraordinary beauty as St. Hilary, Mullion, Little Petherick, Crantock and Blisland—with others scarcely inferior—to set over against the grim dreariness and disrepair of all churches in 1833, we have an accurate measure of our debt to the Revival. Verily it is measureless. And it endures and will endure. It is no matter that the reunion of the Church with architecture and art came by way of Gothic in the one, and Pre-Raphaelitism in the other. The phase of the dominance of any particular school over either as specially ecclesiastical in character has now all but passed. Our newest churches and their modern decorations—to be seen, for instance, at St. Columba's, Liverpool, and St. Nicholas, Burnage, Manchester—have emancipated themselves, according to the new fashion, from all antiquarian or stylistic thralls, and, scarcely risen, persuade their visitors to prayer.

Thus the beauty which was in the soul of Keble, and in the soul of Neale, and the new song of the Catholic creed that they sung, set beauty again alongside of goodness and truth in men's knowledge of God, and made lovely His dwelling-places.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT: SOME OF ITS ISSUES

I

WE are not proposing to give an account of the *history* of the Movement either in its external incidents or as it took shape internally to the minds of its leading men, whether in their individual minds or in their collective mind so far as they were able to achieve such. But I think that we are bound to make something in the way of a synoptic survey of their ideas, if we are to trace out at all what came of the Movement and perhaps yet may come of it.

In order, then, to understand as best we may the aims and the objectives of the Tractarians we will consider first their ἀφορμή, the ground from which they started, because that

ground supplied both a directive and impulsive force to their efforts. Negatively, we must remember, of course, that Newman (who, by the way be it said, pronounced his name as "Nooman") was born and brought up an Evangelical: humanly speaking, he almost owed his soul to Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, and hung upon the lips of Daniel Wilson, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta, preaching on the life and death of Scott (*Apologia*, chap. i.). Scott's portrait is now on the wall of my own house, and his enormous Commentary, a copy of which Newman bought when an undergraduate, used to adorn my shelves, and it fully bears out what the *Apologia* specifies as its characteristic—bold unworldliness and vigorous independence of mind. (And here in a parenthesis I must crave pardon for the *obiter dicta* and especially the personal notes which appear in this paper: it seemed pardonable to introduce what may lend a sense of actuality and nearness to thoughts and strivings half-forgotten in the amazing advance of the past fifty years, and may possibly render an old story less tedious.) Newman "out of his own head" began the Tracts, being opposed in this personal kind of action by Palmer ("the only really learned man among us," he says) and by Palmer's friends; and he remained the inspirer, and at least, until Pusey came in, the controller, of them. With an early inclination such as Newman had, the Low Church position could scarcely have been the prime target of the Tracts, and it certainly was not. These have an Evangelical, if not a Low Church, flavour throughout. The real bugbear was Liberalism in politics and latitudinarianism in religion. "The suppression of the Irish Sees was in progress," Newman wrote, "and filled my mind: I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals." Froude and he considered "a stand had to be made against Liberalism." This was serious enough in the State: it was worse in the Church. Hugh Rose "some years earlier had been the first to give warning (Newman thought, from the University pulpit at Cambridge) of the perils to England which lay in the biblical and theological speculations of Germany" (*ibid.*, ii.). This was the point of danger all along; and, later, Pusey paid an extended visit to German universities, and studied German biblical writings exhaustively; and declares in the Preface to his commentary on the Minor Prophets that he had been able to gain very little from them. Newman asserts that the first plank in his platform "was the principle of dogma: my battle was with liberalism: by liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments." From the age of fifteen dogma had been the fundamental principle of his religion: he could not enter into the idea of any other sort of religion: religion as a mere sentiment was to him a dream and a mockery; and he hoped,

please God, to hold the same view to the end (*ibid.*). "Such was the fundamental principle of the Movement of 1833," he says.

II

We may well enquire what were the means adopted to counteract this dreaded liberalism. The Tractarians scarcely, I think, attempted to meet the liberals on their own field. I am by no means sure that they would not have shown themselves very competent champions had they done so. But probably it would have seemed to them almost an irreverence to enter into discussion of opinions which they regarded as wickedly disloyal to the Revelation. Therefore they preferred a simple reassertion of the dogmatic position: they endeavoured to contribute "towards the practical revival of doctrines which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members" (Advt. to Tracts).

What, then, were these doctrines? The Tracts were addressed *Ad clerum*, *Ad scholas*, or *Ad populum*; they began with the first—with "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission." "I am but one of yourselves—a Presbyter. . . . We have confessed our belief that through the Bishop who ordained us we received the Holy Ghost. . . . Are these words idle (which would be taking God's Name in vain), or do they not rather indicate that the speaker is conveying a gift? But whence is his right to do so? . . . He could not give what he had never received. It is plain, then, that he *transmits*; and that the Christian ministry is a *succession*. And if we trace back the power of ordination from hand to hand, of course we shall come to the Apostles at last . . . a plain historical fact." Then almost immediately (Tract 3) follows an appeal to the Faithful generally (written by Keble, but embodying a principle which was one of Newman's guides all through his life, and which he says that he got straight from Bishop Butler—that *probability* is the guide in thinking and acting, and that we ought not to expect *indubitable* evidences of Divine working, or await clear commands)—an appeal to adhere to the Apostolic Succession because that is the safest course. "Consider the analogy of an absent parent, or dear friend in another hemisphere. Would not such a one naturally reckon it a sign of sincere attachment, if, when he returned home, he found that in all family questions respect had been shown especially to those in whom he was known to have had most confidence? . . . If his children . . . had searched diligently where and with whom he had left commissions, and, having found such, had scrupulously conformed themselves, as

far as they could, to the proceedings of those so trusted by him, would he not think this a better sign than if they had been dexterous in devising exceptions, in explaining away words of trust, and limiting the prerogatives he had conferred ?"

To this is appended a short note on altering the Prayer Book: "Where is the competent authority ? Is it not clear that it does not lie in the British legislature, composed not only of believers, but also of infidels, heretics, and schismatics; and which may soon cease to be a Christian body even in formal profession ? . . . If some measure of tyranny be ever practised against us as regards the Prayer Book, how are we to act ?" Had they not foresight ? It is interesting to speculate on what position they would have adopted in the circumstances that have eventuated.

Then comes a short address to his lay-brethren by the layman, J. W. Bowden, on the Nature and Constitution of the Church and the English branch of it (Tract 5). Note here the emergence of the "Branch Theory," though afterwards the Church of England is spoken of as "a part" or "representative" of the Church Universal. This Tract concludes in an exhortation to "filial love and affectionate reverence towards the collective Church and her Pastors, a zeal for pure doctrine, and the extension of her heavenly fold, with a determination to stand by her." The formation of the Church Catholic as the Home of Grace was shown to have been the grand object of Divine Providence in Robt. Isaac Wilberforce's *Outline of Ancient History*, called "The Five Empires."

In the first volume (as the Tracts are usually bound up) there are Tracts on a number of other subjects, such as the Ember Days, the Athanasian Creed, Fasting, and Mortification in general, but the Church and her ministry are the main topics up to No. 40. In this, in an account of a conversation about a young man who is going to marry a Baptist girl, the topic of Holy Baptism is brought in—its necessity, and blessing, and how "Our Lord joined together the high, mysterious and spiritual doctrine of the Trinity with the no less mysterious communication of grace by water Baptism; and how they who begin by being so bold as to despise the water often very naturally end by despising the Sacred Name which He commanded" to be used. Later on, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is very fully set out and emphasized. Two-thirds of the way through the series Pusey comes in with four Tracts on this matter, and there is a long letter to a Magazine reprinted defending Dr. Pusey's distinction between regeneration and sanctification, the former of which is a gift of the Gospel exclusively, the latter to all good men.

Long before these Tracts were issued, the necessity and advantage of Frequent Communion had been urged in an extract from Bishop Beveridge's sermon, which is reprinted. Our Blessed Lord expressly commanded the Sacrament to be celebrated "often," and those who take it but seldom do not fully obey or come up to His Law; the Apostles broke the Bread daily (he reads Acts ii. 46 sacramentally, and κατ' οἶκον as meaning in some private house or more probably in some chamber of the Temple) or at least upon the Lord's Day; in Justin Martyr's time the Eucharist was held every Sunday, and "none offered to go out until it was over," else they were cast out of the Church as unworthy to be called Christians: our Church supposes, or at any rate hopes, that there will be daily Communion, for it is provided that the Sunday collect, epistle, and gospel shall serve all the week (Tract 26). Next come lengthy pieces from Bishop Cosin, establishing the Spiritual Presence and controverting Transubstantiation. The Body and Blood are "really offered to all by" the Elements, "not only fitly represented by" them: "this is spiritual, yet no less true and undoubted than if it were corporal." We all openly profess with St. Bernard that the presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is spiritual, and therefore true and real; and with the same St. Bernard and all the Ancients we deny that the Body of Christ is carnally either present or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiously forbear to enquire into the manner. "Our faith doth not make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the Word of Christ." The Body and the Consecrated Bread are "by divine appointment made one," so that the names of the sign and the thing signified are reciprocally interchangeable, "and both are united in time, though not in place." (We may observe in passing that in arguing against the Roman doctrine Cosin seems, like our own Article 28, to mistake the significance of the scholastic term "Substance," since he says that the substance of the Bread "appears to our senses," which, of course, scholastic substance never does or could; and that Cosin also denies "that the Elements still retain the nature of Sacraments when not used according to the divine institution —*i.e.*, given and received—so that Christ in the consecrated bread . . . cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicant." One wonders whether, when the Sacrament is carried from the Altar to a sick person in his home, no communion takes place at all; or whether Christ, who has meanwhile deserted the consecrated Bread, repossesses it for the moment. Cosin says that the visible and the Invisible are united in time: is it then a question of duration? And, after all, can time limit

eternal Being? These points, unhappily, are not out of date yet.)

There are extensive *catenæ patrum* concerning these matters, which are the chief. To Confession there is, I believe, no allusion in the Tracts except in one near the close of them (Tract 71), where its *obligatory* use is dwelt upon as a "practical grievance" in the Roman Communion. The liturgical papers are mostly a defence of our Prayer Book; and of ceremonial nothing is said, though there is a Tract on rites and customs (Tract 34) by Newman which is extremely characteristic of his mentality.

Two other lines of thought ought to be mentioned, belonging to the religious ethos, rather than to the doctrine, of the Movement: the first is the high reverence with which Holy Scripture was treated; and the second, arising out of this, the method of Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge. The Tractarians did recognize adequately the human element in the Bible. "Very large portions of it, if not far the greater part of it" (so writes Newman), "are written in as free and unconstrained a manner . . . as if God had had no share in the work. . . . Whatever else is true about it, this is true—that we may speak of the history, or mode of its composition, as truly as of that of other books . . . it has all such characteristics as might attach to a book uninspired" (Tract 85, p. 30). Indeed, they insist upon this; but they would have been shocked beyond measure if told that it "recounts the sordid and legendary history of a Hebrew patriarch, and utters the screaming resentment of an early Christian apocalyptist at the delay in the Divine vengeance upon the wicked" (I quote from recently published Hale Lectures); or that "much in the Hebrew-Christian Bible, not only does not reveal God, but positively misrepresents Him, and cannot be accepted as final," or that "much is to be said for impatience with the Bible" (*New Horizons of the Christian Faith*, Grant, Dean of Western Theological Seminary, Illinois, 1927-28). The Tractarians protest that already in their day, although the Scriptures "are pronounced Divine, they are treated as if they were not"; and that "all fear of God's awful presence in regard to them is lost"; the words are "first brought down to some low, limited sense, and then thought to clash with each other." On the contrary, they discern some spiritual meaning and reference in all the minutiæ, and think it a profanation to assert otherwise. There are depths to be sounded and treasures to be unlocked; and these are revealed only to a teachable spirit by patient contemplation in "mystical silence." And all this because it is ever God's way to "hide Himself," and not to permit Himself to be found except by faith and obedience; and

as it was our Saviour's way, both before and after His resurrection, so it is the way of Holy Scripture; and so it should be our way alike in seeking and in manifesting Christian truth. This reserve is on God's part considerateness, and on ours modesty (Tract 87, pp. 119, 120).

Professor Henry Melville Gwatkin, the most joyously belligerent and certainly the most learned Protestant whom I have known, says that "the Tractarians produced very little that was not thoroughly uncritical, even for its own time. Unhistorical theories drove them to special pleading on every page" (*Knowledge of God*, ii. 281). No doubt that is true—indeed, a truism, and therefore without sting. Their whole system necessarily and avowedly involved special pleading, if by that you mean attempting to justify their doctrines out of the Bible; for they held that there existed a faith and practice, divinely revealed, anterior to and external to the Bible, and that of this they were bound to discover proofs therein, or at least indications; and indications they regarded as enough for a mind rightly tempered. "It is nothing to the purpose," writes Newman in his first work, *Arians* (chap. ii., sect. 2), "whether or not we should have been able to draw the doctrine from the Scriptures had it never been suggested to us in the Creeds. For it has been (providentially) so suggested to all of us; and the question is not, what should have been done had we never had external assistance; but, taking things as we find them, whether the clue to the meaning of Scripture being given, we may not deduce the doctrine thence by as argumentative a process as that which enables us to verify the received theory of gravitation, which perhaps we could never have discovered for ourselves, though possessed of the data from which the inventor drew his conclusions." They were no critics; but scholars they surely were. Witness their Patristic productions—the Catena Aurea, translated from St. Thomas Aquinas; the Library of the Fathers (mostly done by Marriott), the Anglo-Catholic Library; the Commentary on the Gospels, by Isaac Williams, chiefly from ancient sources; and sound learning was always one of their principal weapons and most trusted resources.

The Tractarians were idealists—recollect Newman's *Ideal of a University*, and W. G. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*;* but they did not despise familiar instruments. Their sermons, Keble's and Pusey's, too dull and long for today, are packed with solid teaching; and so are the Plain Sermons and the Sermons on the Catechism by Williams. Newman's are strangely

* If these high-souled men avowed their idealism mainly at the close of their Anglican career, was this more than the open profession of vision of ideals which had been moving them throughout? In a non-philosophical sense, idealists: but also realists, as no mere visionaries.

in the strict sense undoctrinal—perhaps an instance of the *disciplina arcani*; but I think in them alone do we get a developed picture of the Christian character and life. And I remark that in a volume which came out under Roman auspices last year, called *A Newman Synthesis*, much the greater space is occupied by extracts from his Anglican writings; and those dealing with religious duty and experience are in the main from the sermons at St. Mary's. We may question whether the quality of his thought showed an improvement after he left his old moorings, except for the profound *Grammar of Assent*. The *Essay on Development* was perhaps thought out largely for his own comfort and justification, if it was published to ease the path of other pilgrims.

To my mind the Tracts are readable still. Soon after my ordination I bought them in bound volumes, and have learned a great deal from them, and often turn to them now for their Catholic teaching and atmosphere of pious strictness. One volume which I have of the *Parochial Sermons* contains the dedication to Thomas Dudley Ryder in Newman's autograph of St. Andrew's Day, 1838. His very neat penmanship helps one to realize his living tones, so precise and unemotional, as we are told they were.

There is a passage in one of those sermons which seems to describe pathetically the Tractarians' experience. "Look through the Bible," said Newman, "and you will find God's servants, even though they begin with success, end with disappointment; not that God's purposes or His instruments fail, but that the time for reaping what we have sown is hereafter, not here; that there is no great visible fruit in any one man's lifetime" (*Parochial Sermons*, viii. 129). The harvest of their seed has been slow in growing and has not reached maturity yet. Worthy successors carried on their work, and some better things were reserved for us.

It is natural to connect particular persons with the advancement of particular features of the original undertaking. Palmer was the only one of the primitive band who was a professed student of Liturgies: he was breaking new ground for the Church of England; but similar investigations were brought to bear on our own Service Books by Philip Freeman, William Keeling, and William Maskell. Of literary scholarship in the sub-Tractarian times Dean Church is a good instance. The doctrine of the Church and Ministry I do not associate with any special protagonist (unless it be Haddan); but it is attack which raises up defenders, and *that* doctrine was then more neglected than controverted. Baptismal Regeneration was a burning issue in the institution of Mr. George Cornelius Gorham to Brampforde Speke, which

Bishop Henry Philpotts opposed with all his power, and which was the immediate occasion of Archdeacon Manning passing across to the Roman obedience. At this date (1850) Canon Christopher Wordsworth preached three sermons in Westminster Abbey in proof of the doctrine, and arguing that our Baptismal Offices cannot "be interpreted in a hypothetical sense"; and the study of those sermons, which are composed with all his usual knowledge and reverence, was of considerable help to myself as a young priest in settling my opinion and future teaching, and no doubt did much to discredit what was then called "the charitable view" of the words. It was the same stout Henry of Exeter who vindicated the right and duty of hearing Confessions in the case of St. Peter's, Plymouth. Pusey, of course, wrote an exhaustive treatise on Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; but Archdeacon Denison of Taunton was one of the strongest upholders of the Real Presence, and I believe the first to suffer for his faith. His widow long survived him, and I knew her well as an aged lady who displayed in a firm and gentle graciousness the beauty of a Christian life sustained by the Sacraments. To the Archdeacon's nephew, Henry Denison, now living at Wells, I owe very much both for enlightenment and for friendship. He tells with delightful humour how the Bishop of Bath arrived at Taunton to try his uncle with the judgment all ready written out and concealed in his hat. The offence lay in maintaining that the Presence was independent of our attitude towards it, and that therefore it was real even to the unworthy receiver. Henry himself suffered for his association with the culprit, and it was many years before the Bishop would advance him to the priesthood.

A little later Liddon was a great supporter of "the supernatural power of the Sacraments," asserting in his Bampton Lectures (Lecture VIII.) that "if the Socinian and Zwinglian estimate had been that of the Church of Christ, the Sacraments would long ago have been abandoned as useless ceremonies." I suppose that in Liddon it was the combination of careful thought, clear language, a musical voice, and obvious earnestness which constituted the appeal he made: he read every word from a manuscript and could scarcely have been called an orator; but I have stood for three-quarters of an hour or more in a church where every seat was filled, to listen to him. The critics pronounce the hymn, "When morning gilds the sky," one of the worst in the book; but it makes me think of the wonderful scene in St. Paul's when I watched his coffin lowered into the crypt below the Dome while that hymn of praise was sung—a curious choice, some might think, for a funeral, but surely fitting in the case of so great a pleader for the Divinity of our Lord. Nor

must we forget Scott Holland, whose many-sided mind touched and illuminated, not only dogmatics, but also apologetics and social philosophy. An address I heard him deliver on St. Barnabas has stuck in my mind all these years—"a good man," and I have often thought that much of it might be treated as descriptive of himself. It has been asked, both by those who would like to say yes and by those to whom the idea is most abhorrent, whether the Tractarian movement lay on the highway of reunion with Rome. The original writers protested that it did not and could not. Perhaps in some, especially Newman, this was "over-compensation"; but the second generation was emphatic, too, in maintaining the distinctiveness and the soundness of the Anglican position—*e.g.*, T. T. Carter, who wrote as "an Aged Priest" (1888) "on the Roman Question." "To submit," he says, "and nothing less will be entertained, is not merely a question of preference. It is a denial of what we have believed; a denial of our Lord's presence; a denial of the work of the Holy Ghost"; and the sole "ground of this holocaust is the supposed infallibility of one See." "We should be ungrateful if we did not claim to be not a whit behind the churches of the Roman obedience in their essential characteristics. Let us be patient," he concludes, ". . . offering continually, as Keble enjoined us, our Lord's prayer as a prayer for Church union, and remembering His own Eucharistic petition." Doubtless, wide acceptance of something like the Tractarian standpoint is a necessary condition of corporate reunion; but I am convinced that submission is no logical consequence of this, but rather that Rome must in the long run recognize its validity, so that it will become the basis of a sisterly agreement. In the sphere of Liturgiology the earlier writers to whom allusion has been made did not lack followers. John Mason Neale accomplished work that is simply marvellous for its quantity, no less than for its quality, in forty-seven years of life; but he was a student from boyhood, and I have been told by a surviving relative of his that in the family circle he was allowed, contrary to general rule, to read a book at meals, and habitually did so. Beresford Hope, asserting that the recovery of decorum in public worship was not a matter in which "a knot of clergymen" was in controversy with "practically the whole body of lay church-people," did much to secure what he terms the "statuesque" dignity of its rendering proper to the English Communion (*Worship in the Church of England*, 1874); while men like George A. Poole endeavoured to foster an intelligent appreciation of her inheritance in architecture (*A History of Ecclesiastical Architecture*, 1847); and Edward L. Cutts inculcated good taste in *Church Furniture and Decoration* (1854). But

it might perhaps be questioned whether the teaching might not have gone on permeating the Church without violent mob opposition if its ceremonial embodiment had been postponed. "Segnius irritant animi demissa per aurem quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus."

The Tractarians were not, so far as appears in the Tracts, very clearly determined as to prayer for the departed: the first mention of commemorations for the dead is in Tertullian, but so (according to their argument) is the first allusion to the Epistle to Philemon: the same objections can be raised to this as to that: only "let us believe what we do not see and know. . . . Let us maintain before we have proved. . . . Providence can teach us by the witness of the Church Catholic" (Tract 85, p. 83). Archbishop Ussher is quoted to the effect that such prayers were omitted from public use because the Roman Purgatory was deduced from them; and there the matter is left (Tract 72, p. 59). To Robert Dolling much is due for preparing the way for what the Great War completed. Many of us will remember his rotund figure and smiling countenance, and know well the Requiem Altar in St. Agatha's, Portsmouth, which was the starting-point of the harrying policy that undoubtedly hastened his death.

Of the authors of the Tracts, only three or four were parochial clergy, but the men who carried their teachings into practice in the parishes were a wonderful band, certainly. I must not take time even to mention them—men like Mackonochie (what a pathetic shock to some of us his death in the snowy uplands of Scotland was!); Butler of Wantage, afterwards Dean of Lincoln (the name brings back a good talk with him on the Order of Deaconesses, a subject very near his heart, at the Exeter Church Congress of 1894, to which I had been called officially): Randolph of Clifton, afterwards Dean of Chichester (whose singular devotedness at the Holy Eucharist in his extreme old age used greatly to impress me); Stanton (I cannot forget how, when once I put a difficult case to him, he had scarcely more to utter than just the phrase of Jeremiah, "The people that were left found grace in the wilderness"—yes, they found grace in the wilderness—a single sentence which in his mouth was worth a pile of reasoning). Fr. Stanton, by the way, was rather a surprising person in a good many ways—for instance, his sermons (which drew great congregations in the West End, though I suspect that he loved his postmen better) appeared to be, and were generally thought to be, almost spontaneous utterances, but were elaborately prepared beforehand as he sat over his study-fire, and were then carefully written out, as was seen when they were published; he constantly went about on the "knife-board"

of the old horse omnibuses, and was generally thought to be very poor, but he left behind him quite a little fortune—over £50,000, if I recollect rightly, an instance of a man "poor in spirit." Pelham Dale, Sidney Faithorn Green, and Arthur Tooth were at heart parish priests, though by necessity protagonists. The social implications of the Faith—particularly what it should mean for the problems of large towns—had been considered in other quarters (Maurice and Kingsley), and barely came into the purview of the Oxford writers. Stewart Headlam, a dapper little person in a tightly-buttoned jacket, not a bit like the typical long-haired reformer, was, I believe, the earliest Catholic-minded priest to set this aspect in the forefront. Shuttleworth, Dolling and Scott Holland, upon whose other activities I just now touched, took up the cause, and it is a very living one today. (*Cf.* two articles by Ruth Kenyon, THEOLOGY, June and July, 1932.)

This brings me to my conclusion. What have we today gained, or rather what *should* we gain, from the Movement of a hundred years ago, with its continuous line of development down to our own time? Its leading doctrines, such as have been specified, are now mostly of the common stock of ordinary teaching: we need say nothing about them, except to thank God that it is so. And the same about care of sacred buildings and decency of worship. Three things, however, I will speak shortly of, since I am afraid that in them the intervening period has seen a retrogression instead of an advance. (1) The first is reverence for Scripture. I cannot but think that critical study, which is no doubt a further revelation in these latter days from God, might be pursued in a more becoming spirit than it sometimes is. We cannot think of Inspiration precisely as the Tractarians did; but, after all, it was the Divine Spirit who moved men of old to write the Bible and compile its Canon. It may be right to dissect the Bible like other ancient documents; but it ought to be handled with the full respect that *they* are—and much more. It is, of course, the record of a growing discernment of divine things and of a divine purpose; but I am not sure that our apprehension of the moral law and our understanding of the divine counsels are sufficient to justify us in condemning out of hand the more primitive portions of it as wholly contrary to the Divine Will or Nature. Criticism may break into fragments the rock of Scripture, and label the pieces; but I doubt whether it can smelt out the precious ore; and perhaps some valuable fragments are lost in the process. Benvenuto Cellini tells us of a dishonest apprentice who made a lot of money by collecting the gold-dust from the work-bench: perhaps the master was a little slap-

dash, and so many chips need not have been knocked off; but, anyhow, when the critics are at work, it is well, like the apprentice, to be "wise in our generation" and sweep up the débris. (2) Next, strictness in religion. This is an easy-going generation, and we sometimes take our tone from it. For the Tractarians the Gospel was not just an idea cast among men to be made this or that pretty much as they thought best, or much or little as might suit them; it was not a nucleus of truth out of which a man might get any credenda that he could; it was not a suggestion for practical conduct that everyone must develop after his own fashion. On the contrary, it was a revelation, in some respects quite clear-cut; it was a body of belief which had Apostolic authority, and which should be accepted as it stood; it was a system of living fairly detailed which was readily discernible in the lives of Christians of other ages. Any declension from it was not a legitimate use of freedom, but a transgression of prescribed bounds. This is an age of emotionalism. Emotionalism was distasteful to the Tractarians as "enthusiasm" to a former period. They desired a deep tinge of austerity, of self-mortification, of calm in outward behaviour. Holy fear was a real and very necessary grace in their sight. The true Christian "is ever dying while he lives; he is on his bier, and the prayers of the sick are saying over him" (*Parochial Sermons*, quoted in *Newman Synthesis*, p. 326). This is a somewhat blatant age. The Tractarians disliked a noisy religion: they deprecated advertisement: they published anonymously: they were frightened of prominence: they believed that the truth should be trusted to propagate itself like leaven. The individual spiritual life, too, grew best in secret—it was "hid with Christ," and should be hidden from the world. Their ideal Christian would not talk loudly or much about his condition—still less prate about it. Men might mistake him at first, but they would find out. He would only dissipate what grace he had by making any sort of show of it. (3) Lastly, quiet continuance in the place and way of duty, finding the best opportunity in it. Think of Charles Marriott, who did nearly all the weary work of translation, or of John Keble at Hursley and Richard Church at Whatley, or of John William Bowden, Newman's "dear earliest friend" (*Apologia*, chap. i.), who produced a considerable historical work (a life of Pope Gregory VII.) drawn from original sources in spare evenings and summer vacations from his ordinary engagements in London in, I think, a Government office.

If in the centenary year we could set ourselves to recover some of the Tractarian temper in these important matters of Reverence, Seriousness, and Patience, we should genuinely be

evidencing our gratitude for all of theirs which already has been achieved, and should be employing some of their best material in building the Church of the future.

A. B. W. WHATTON.

EVANGELICALS AND THE TRACTARIANS

READING over again at this time the story of a hundred years ago, one problem at first not easy to understand is the apparent antipathy from the first of Evangelical* Church-people to the truths which the Tractarians sought to revive. Grant that they were but little interested in the corporate and institutional compared with the personal side of religion, but what was it that to them seemed so inconsistent between what they would call "the Gospel" and the doctrines of the order and sacramental life of the Church? To our generation, which has known men like Bishop George Wilkinson of St. Andrews, Canon Body, prince of Missioners, and Robert Dolling, who combined with intense conviction and (in the two latter cases) with passionate enthusiasm both these elements, it is hardly intelligible, and in the Church of England today the survival of this prejudice is rare save in quite small circles which seem in other ways also to have preserved the mentality of two generations back. For with Evangelicals the first Tractarians shared, and more than shared, deep seriousness in face of the worldliness around them: sternly they demanded repentance personal and national, and the Cross was central in their teaching. On the Incarnation and the Atonement their sacramental doctrines were founded. Years before Charles Wesley had illustrated the unity of these things in his verse and written that most exultant of pure Eucharistic hymns, "Hosanna in the Highest."

In view of all this we might have expected Tractarians and Evangelicals to have felt instinctively united in their spiritual protest against the dry morality and liberal broad Churchmanship which were the spirit of the age, and the actual enemy against whom the Oxford Movement emerged, though it must be remembered that Higher Criticism and Modernism had not yet arisen to unite conservative elements, High and Low, as

* The term "Evangelicalism" is here used in its definite connotation of insistence on the good news of pardon and free grace, accompanied by expectation of the work of the Holy Spirit in conscious personal realization. There is nothing necessarily negative or Protestant in Evangelicalism, unless it be special jealousy for the right of access of the individual soul to God. It is matter of regret that the noble name should be sometimes loosely used for what is merely Low Church or non-sacramentarian, though sharing none of the positive and more inspiring characteristics.

they do today. The reasons for antipathy, when we seek to analyze them, are somewhat complicated. (No attempt is made to document the statements here offered. Those who have leisure to research the recorded comments of contemporary and thoughtful Evangelicals, or are old enough to remember their echoes fifty years ago, will recognize the points subjoined.)

(1) The popular Protestant or anti-Roman prejudice, with its roots historical and political, naturally dominated the Evangelicals in common with most Englishmen, and had been irritated by recent events. But the Evangelicals, inheriting special sympathy with the Evangelical doctrines of Luther and Calvin, reflected their prejudice against Popery on theological grounds also, and anything Catholic, not already familiar to them and shared with Rome, savoured of the enemy. We remember that Newman himself within a very few years of his secession felt strongly that the Roman Church was either the True Church *or anti-Christ*. And the Evangelical clergy were remarkably devoid of erudition, especially in these matters, and not likely to have analyzed Catholic *versus* Roman Catholic claims for themselves.

(2) Superficially, at least, there was a broad doctrinal or homiletic ground of opposition. In personal religion the emphasis of the Tractarians was from the first thrown on holy living and discipline. These things to men who were engaged in proclaiming Justification by Faith alone savoured of a quite opposite religion of Good Works. For it must be remembered that the quest of practical holiness and the special doctrines of sanctification which took Evangelicals, both within and outside the Church, by storm forty years later, and which produced the still potent Keswick Convention and devotional writings like those of Bishop Handley Moule, had not yet appeared. When they did appear, the fact that the doctrines of holiness and of the indwelling Christ then offered, which to a well-taught Catholic appear to contain nothing new, created such a sense of novelty witnesses to the extent to which this side of Christian life had dropped out in Evangelical teaching, and gives ground for the narrow inadequacy of which men of the Oxford Movement accused the Evangelical pulpit at the time.

(3) There were differences of tone and purpose, which seemed to Evangelicals to amount to a "different religion"; for it was not an age when ordinary men talked about "elements of" truth and error: it was an age when they took sides. The Movement was soon changing the professional standards and lives of hundreds of clergy, and a little later launching them with devotion into work among the poorest, and it was beginning to transform the interior of churches; but in the first few years of

the Tracts all this was not yet visible. Evangelicalism in the recent period had changed the hearts and lives of thousands, not only of average laity, but of the outcast, and believed it saw in these conversions something nearer to the New Testament phenomena than what the Movement offered or cared for. The note of its own best religious atmosphere was a peace and serenity merging into joy, which as the second and third "fruits of the spirit" (Gal. v. 22) seemed to accord well with a true *evangelium*. The personal tone of the Movement, however lofty, appeared to be one of anxiety and strain, a religion of the shadow rather than the sunlight, betokening a different heart at its core. Again, it was the business of the Movement to be a disturber of unhealthy harmony in refusal to think and face facts; but the consequence was that it figured as a disturber of the peace, not only like the first Evangelicals themselves in its dealings with men of the careless world, but in the circle of the really pious, while it also broke up their sense of unity with Evangelical-hearted Dissenters.

(4) There were also accidental or secondary causes for loss of sympathy. It happened that more than one of the chief leaders of the new Movement had a positive dislike of emotionalism in religion and of those Methodistic forms which particularly illustrated it. With the new school as a whole severe self-repression and elimination of the personal amounted to a principle; so that either by temperament or by conviction they were particularly unapt to be in sympathy with the characteristics of the Evangelical school. Such causes were psychological rather than doctrinal, but psychological antipathy can be even more effective for alienation than differences of conviction, which may be adjusted by deeper understanding.

(5) To this must be added—it need not be dwelt on—that antipathies were gratuitously provoked very early in the Movement. The weapon of ridicule, savouring sometimes of contempt, was employed by some of its followers with the ostensible (and never very encouraging) aim of trying to make Englishmen think. Compared with the distinguished group of Oxford men who initiated the Movement and some of their earliest supporters, their Evangelical opponents were deficient in learning or cleverness; and inability to cope with the new school on its own ground or to stem the running tide of its surprisingly rapid success threw men back on the resources of suspicion and abuse.

(6) Deeper than any of the above was, we may suppose, an objection, largely subconscious, which operates to this day. Catholicism and the Religions of Experience are actually distinguished by opposing characteristics, though Catholicism claims to leave ample room for all right religious experience.

Religions of Experience include many forms of Christianity, chiefly Protestant, but within the Church of England it was the Evangelical who peculiarly represented what our grandfathers sometimes spoke of as "experimental [*sic*] religion." To make the distinction clear, words already written elsewhere* may be quoted: "This first-hand experience or realization of things unseen is not the whole or the staple of Christian life for the individual, in most instances, or for the community. It needs behind it the stability of the Catholic system. That system may be compared to a mighty viaduct, resting indeed on the foundation of experience, from Pentecost to this hour—experiences regenerative, illuminative, Eucharistic; yet an organic structure which, like the spiritual lives of most of us, only touches that foundation at certain points in the experience of its apostles and prophets and its faithful in all ages. For the individual, and indeed for the Church, there are periods, even long intervals, when vivid experience of things unseen and the powers of the world to come are in abeyance, when prophets are scarce and visibility low in spiritual matters. And then it is that the system comes in to save and carry over, in fixed creed and sacrament and trained habit, the life of the community or of the individual Churchman in one continuous process. We are not left at the mercy of our fitful moods or herd instincts, or flickering spiritual experiences. . . . Behind us in our dullest hours is the truth of the Catholic gospel, the communal experience in which we have part, though for the moment realization fails us. . . . The dimness and fickleness of our experience is swallowed up and borne over in the embracing unity of the Body of Christ." To the old Methodist or Evangelical the more exalted frames of mystical experience or first-hand "assurance" were *the normal condition* of true spiritual life. Advocates of the Catholic system, especially where it was unfamiliar, would appear in the light of men offering, to say the least, a second best instead. The essential difference in religious temperament and attitude was reinforced by the feeling repeatedly to be met with among Evangelicals from John Wesley himself onwards, after they have entered the new experience, that their Church life hitherto, however serious and conscientious, was by comparison not spiritual life at all. The "real thing" in religion was based on the realized consciousness of a new birth, and anything less and lower was a dangerous substitute. The Tractarians, like the Prayer Book, not only laid no emphasis on this subjective experience, as distinct from sincere repentance, but appeared to be turning men's attention to a system which was a substitute for it. This "experience" or "assurance," shared

* *Essays, Catholic and Missionary*, p. 278 *f.*

with Methodists and other Christians, rather than those doctrines of the Atonement and of Grace which it shared with English Catholics, and preached more effectively, was the very heart of distinctive Evangelicalism; and the only "Church" it was really interested in was the invisible community of souls united in such experience. Not that all or most of its members had actually shared it, but they were impressed by the fervent spirits who had done so, and whose lives and teaching had wrought great spiritual change in and outside the borders of the Church: they regarded it as the ideal and liked to think they had shared it, or at least to conform to it. At the time of the Oxford Movement its adherents probably represented two-thirds of vital religion in England. To this side of religious life Catholicism was, more truly than they understood, "an alternative," and is so still; and till the true complementary relation of these alternatives is realized Catholicism will impoverish itself by ignoring the Evangelicalism which by right should vitalize it, and Evangelicalism will be inclined to belittle the Catholic Revival.

CECIL SOUTHAMPTON:

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

In response to our request for some recollections of the making of *Lux Mundi*, Bishop Talbot, one of the two remaining survivors of the group of essayists, has kindly contributed the following:

"My first recollection is that Gore and Holland came to me with the suggestion of something of the kind. I fancy the group of authors was formed by our adding in consultation the names of those who would take part. "Inevitables" were, Moore, Illingworth, Lock; and we had no real hesitation, as far as I remember, about Ottley and Campion.

I cannot remember how far we suggested subjects to these people, or asked them to suggest them.

I suppose we had been in some degree prepared for acting together by the existence of what was called the "Association," a body of Churchmen which held a Celebration at St. Mary's once a term, and met in the evening for conversation, debate and reading of papers, etc., twice a term. It may bear on our present topic that I remember how, after one of these meetings at which Gore had read a paper, a Professor, writing to me on some other matter next day, referred to the evening on which the "principles of Strauss and Ewald had attained their melancholy triumph," the reference being to a paper of Gore's. This foreshadowed the famous trouble over Gore's paper on Inspiration in *Lux Mundi*.

I suppose, but cannot be sure, that we had a meeting of us all before we set out on our separate tasks. There must of course have been a considerable interval before we met for the consideration of the Essays singly. This was done rather carefully.

Of such meetings one of two or three days was at Malvern, one in Holland's rooms in his house in Amen Court and several at Oxford. This process was of course an important part of the matter and served to give an increase of unity to the book. Comment and criticism were freely made, but there was not in most cases a second reading. In the case of one Essay the comment amounted to definite criticism; the writer took it in admirable part and produced later a second draft of his Essay which really embodied the criticisms and made considerable change. I remember feeling gratified when some critic said that he thought *that* writer's Essay in altered shape was the *most* impressive.

I should like to remember more distinctly how much criticism there was of Gore's Essay. My impression is that there was a good deal of comment or discussion, but on the whole substantial agreement and no desire for re-casting."

NOTE

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN 1837

At a time when so much is being written about the origins of the Oxford Movement, it may be of interest to revive a forgotten controversy which seems to show that the Evangelicals were the innovators, at least so far as Anglicanism as it emerged in the final settlement of 1662 is concerned.

The book which enshrines the controversy is entitled *Two Memorials: addressed to the General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on the alleged corrupt character of some of its publications* (London: L. and G. Seeley. 1837. Demy octavo. Pages viii+110). The authors are five Essex incumbents: Hastings Robinson, D.D., Henry Budd, Guy Bryan, Charles Isaac Yorke, and Henry B. S. Harris. They were all members of the S.P.C.K., and they expressed a dissatisfaction which had been simmering for some years. In 1834 the Society had replied to memorials received from various District Committees, to the effect "that it is not disposed to yield to unreasonable objections, nor to give up those principles of sound doctrine which it has so long maintained: and that it is most anxious to maintain unchanged the character of the Society." This reply did not satisfy the objectors, who in the next year made two definite requests: (1) that Fox's Book of Martyrs be republished by the Society, and (2) that the existing Tracts be subjected to a thorough revision. On January 5, 1836, the Secretary replied that the republication of Fox's book was considered inexpedient, and that the attention of the Committee was being given to Tracts against Popery. On April 5, a General Meeting was held, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Howley) being in the Chair, and the Bishops of London, Bangor and Gloucester being also present. The Standing Committee reported that the Tract Committee declined to undertake the revision of old books and tracts; they had therefore decided that the duty of carrying out such revision should revert to the Standing Committee, who, however, doubted "whether they shall be able to discharge (it) in such a manner as to obviate all objections, or to give universal satisfaction" (S.P.C.K. Annual Report for 1836).

The particular tract on which discussion centred was Bishop Wilson's *Short and Plain Instruction for the better understanding of the Lord's Supper*. The Tract Committee declined to consider any change of wording. It is significant that the Committee, which consisted of seven members, included Hugh James Rose, of Hadleigh, at whose house the famous meeting was held in 1833. (He was also a member of the Foreign Translation Commitee of the S.P.C.K., as was Dr. Pusey.) The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were sufficiently interested in the matter to attend the meeting at which the Committee's action was reported and by implication approved, since the Standing Committee clearly intended to do nothing.

The five clergymen already mentioned then prepared their book, which was "respectfully dedicated to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Right Rev. the Bishops, the Rev. the Clergy," and to the members of the S.P.C.K. What interest it aroused I do not know; the King, for one, was occupied with other matters in these last months of his life, as readers of Lytton Strachey's *Queen Victoria* will remember.

After a reference to "the present renewed aggression of Popish principles upon us," which presumably means *Tracts for the Times*, the writers launch their main attack. The circumstances of the time when the Society was founded account for the deficiencies of its publications. About 1690, so Bishop Burnet wrote in 1713, Tillotson (then Dean of St. Paul's), Patrick, Bishop of Chichester, and he planned a new Book of Homilies.

> In the six Sundays to Whitsuntide (said Burnet) the doctrine of Justification was to be explained; and some expressions in the first book (of Homilies) that seemed to carry *Justification by faith only*, to

> *a height that wanted some mitigation*, were to be well examined; and all that St. Paul had writ on that head, both to the Romans, and the Galatians, was to be explained, and reconciled to what James wrote on the same subject.

Some of the Homilies were written, "dry and unevangelical" in character. A typical example of error is a statement by Burnet, approved by Tillotson, that "a charitable man that has had much occasion given him to forbear and forgive others, and to do good for evil, *dares lay claim to mercy and pardon*, with much humble assurance." "Such," say the writers, "was the divinity provided for the Church of England, by the Divines in whom this Society originated. . . . The same erroneous style of doctrine has prevailed from the very origin of the Society to the present day."

The Society has consistently refrained from promulgating Reformation doctrine; its publications show a legal spirit throughout; they have "impeded the progress of divine truth by an unhappy admixture of error."

Two works published by the S.P.C.K. have had an especially large circulation, Nelson's *Festivals and Fasts*, and *The Whole Duty of Man*. These are subjected to a detailed criticism.

What are "Saints in the Church Militant?" asks Nelson, and answers:

> Such who not only believe the doctrines of the Christian religion, but conform their whole life to the precepts of it; such who not only have a holy faith, but are purified thereby; who have a sincere regard to God and another world in all their actions, and are constant and uniform in the discharge of their duty; who abstain from all kind of evil, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Impossible! say the memorialists; such a man "is not the subject of mercy; he requires no Saviour." Other errors are shown in Nelson's teaching about fasting and repentance—"We must repent to make us capable of that pardon He hath purchased for us," and in what he says about the possibility of conquering particular vices.

> What wonder if this Papist in spirit should hold doctrines expressly Papistical, such as—the Saints praying for us, and Mary, the Mother of God?

It is really remarkable, in view of the common judgment passed on pre-Tractarian Anglicanism, that the S.P.C.K. all through the eighteenth (as well as the nineteenth) century promoted the sale of Nelson's book.

The Whole Duty of Man is "a work built on the same false and unscriptural principles as the preceding one." "The scheme of salvation, interwoven throughout," is "essentially defective, unsound, and dangerous." A particularly harmful passage is this:

> The third thing that Christ was to do for us, was to enable us, or give us strength to do what God requires of us . . . requiring of us only an honest and hearty endeavour to do what we are able, and where we fail, accepting of sincere repentance.

Members of the Society are asked "solemnly to pause, and to consider the awful condition in which the Society, as they apprehend, appears as a Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."

Minor works on the Catalogue are next examined. For example, *First Steps to the Catechism* contains this Question and Answer:

> 12. Q. What must we do that we may obtain God's forgiveness?
> A. We must be sorry for our sins, and leave them off, and pray to God to forgive us, for the sake of Jesus Christ.

That is to say, the child is taught to obtain salvation by works.

Another tract, with the "Popish" title *A Companion to the Altar*, refers to "strict preparation" with a view to being "accepted by God as worthy communicants." It contains the un-Evangelical prayer:

> Clothe me with the wedding garment, even the graces of the Gospel, and then I am sure that I shall be a welcome guest at the table, when I shall come thither in the likeness of Thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom Thou art well pleased. . . .
> Therefore help me to supply in humility what I want in worthiness.

The memorialists are hard to please; the wedding garment can mean nothing but free grace.

The attack is carefully documented by quotations from the Articles and the Homilies, which seem to teach different doctrine. If the premiss is granted, that these sixteenth-century formulas are the doctrinal standards of Anglicanism, the memorialists have a strong case. But they prove too much. On their own showing, the whole doctrinal position of official Anglicanism during the eighteenth century was non-Evangelical. Evangelicalism in the second half of the century was something radically new, an emphasizing of certain aspects of sixteenth-century theology which had failed to influence the Church of England hitherto. The writers of the Memorial have no good word to say of the intervening generations. We willingly admit that they have a case. The official theology presupposed grace in its teaching, but was in danger of neglecting it in practice, and of merely inculcating good works. Pelagianism has always been a danger for Englishmen. Nevertheless the sanity and solidity of a traditional Anglican piety provided a splendid foundation for the nineteenth-century revival. It is customary now to find the essence of Tractarianism in "moralism," consciously pursued in reaction from a degenerate conception of "salvation by faith." But any such moralistic movement was simply a continuation of the common Anglican tradition, from which Evangelicalism had diverged.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

REVIEWS

THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT, 1833-1845. A Study of the Oxford Movement as a Phase of the Religious Revival in Western Europe in the Second Quarter of the Nineteenth Century. By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. Oxon, Hon. D.D. Aberdeen; formerly Bishop of Manchester. Putnam. 10s. 6d.

The sub-title of this book is extended in the preface by the addition of the words "and particularly to indicate the reasons why that Movement failed to establish its ideal of the Anglican Church in relation to the Holy Catholic Church." Save for one section, the whole may be regarded as an amplification of that statement, and its appeal will necessarily be chiefly to those who are prepared in advance to find in it a confirmation of their own opinions. From the same preface they will learn that Newman's *Apologia* is "written in a passion of self-admiration evoked by Kingsley's fierce criticism," that Dean Church's book on the Oxford Movement is "the work of a partisan who has not recovered from the party spirit engendered in one of the most violent of controversies," and that "throughout his work runs a vein of subconscious dislike and contempt of the opponents of his school." Such language at the outset places a reviewer in a difficulty, for the author's venerable age sets him far closer in time to the Movement of which he is treating than any other modern writer on the subject, and the respect to which he is entitled for a life-long championship of principles which he regards as matters not of opinion but *stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ* forbids the dismissal of the latter strictures by the classical tag which irreverently suggests itself. Whether or not controversy ever serves a useful purpose beyond the dubious one of providing additional material for historical students may be debated, and certainly Bishop Knox is better to read week by week when discoursing unpolemically on the deepest subjects than when indulging in reflections of the kind illustrated above.

There was room for a study of the Tractarian Movement from a more critical standpoint than seems congenial to most of those who undertake to describe it, partly, perhaps, because the materials available are so large in bulk that few find time or opportunity to master more than a small portion of them, and the effort to set forth the results of a dispassionate examination is seldom duly appreciated. If the present volume cannot be regarded as supplying the need—indeed, the really difficult questions which arise where the history is obscure are left

almost entirely undiscussed—it will none the less serve a useful purpose in calling attention to points where statements commonly made with the best and most eirenic of intentions do not stand the test of examination. An outstanding example is the effort to establish the affiliation of the Movement to the Evangelical Revival. In regard to this the author says that "of popular misconceptions concerning the Tractarian Movement none is more misleading than that which regards it as a continuation or outcome of the Evangelical Movement." Save by a process of argumentation which would enable one triumphantly to establish the connection of anything with everything else or by the adoption of the familiar expedient of contending that while a statement may not be formally accurate there is still "something in it," the Bishop's conclusion can scarcely be evaded by anyone who undertakes a really serious study of the literature of the period. But neither, as we venture to think, will he feel able to accept the accuracy of the sketch of the position of the Evangelicals at the time of the rise of the Tractarians as given in various parts of this book and notably in the chapter entitled "the Evangelicals or 'Old Contemptibles.'" The author speaks of "so cautious a man as Dr. Hort" being "carried off his balance" by Newman; and the reaction of such a man to the influence of F. D. Maurice and of Newman is a very interesting feature in the religious history of the nineteenth century. But there lies before the reviewer as he writes a little volume inside the cover of which is written "F. J. A. Hort," and which contains a remarkable article entitled "Oxford and Evangelical Churchmen," first published in the *British Quarterly Review* for May, 1845. The writer, the Rev. Robert Vaughan, D.D., was not a member of the Church of England: he had as little sympathy as Bishop Knox with many of the tenets and practices of those whom he describes as "the haughty disciples of Tractarianism," but rightly or wrongly he seems to find in the degree of their success the measure of the failure of contemporary Evangelicalism within the Church of England. The wounds that he inflicts may seem at times more faithful than friendly, but they are not intentionally unkindly when he writes: "But only conceive of such men as are now conspicuous on the side of Tractarianism—men of vigorous and chastened imagination; men of fine sensibility; men whose minds are disposed to range over the most extended fields of ecclesiastical literature and learning; whose habits dispose them to indulge in close, if not in abstract, reasoning; who look with a feeling of exquisite interest to those social revolutions which in past times have affected the long course of ecclesiastical forms, and the ever-changing shades of theological opinion; who delight

to trace out the thread-work which, from remote ages, has been tending to render the present age what it is—conceive of such men as bending their scrutiny on evangelical religion, as it is presented in the case of large numbers of evangelical professors; scanning its crude, narrow, and ill-adjusted theology; its severance from the semblance of acute and powerful argumentation; its destitution of nearly all the elements of historical association, and of anything resembling that poetic grandeur, or beauty, or appropriateness, with which such men are disposed to clothe the objects of their thoughts and sympathies—look to all this, and what can be anticipated as the result? Assuredly very much that which has followed."

The Bishop calls attention to "the deficient equipment of the Tractarians," and it is indeed a fact which presents itself in many curious ways to the observation of any later student. The Tractarian Movement was a young men's movement with the limitations which that necessarily implies, but also with the possibilities and the appeal; and no wise historian will allow his recognition of the one feature to affect unduly his estimate of the others. He can, if he will, watch them learning as well as hear some of them say many indiscreet, hastily dogmatic, even uncharitable words which are not excused by the fact that parallels may be adduced from the language of Evangelicals with regard to Dissenters in general and Methodists in particular. But the products of their learning awakened the interest and, in some cases at least, the gratitude of men who were far from embracing their opinions; and the same quest of new learning provided a much-needed stimulus in directions which, if certainly not altogether disregarded, were receiving inadequate attention. And by contrast if anyone should ever have the experience which once befell the reviewer of reading the complete works of the Rev. Charles Simeon—it takes a very long time to accomplish the task—followed by a perusal of Sir Arthur Hort's Life of his father, he will hardly fail to see why great as were Mr. Simeon's services to the Church and his power of influencing men of a certain type, others must have felt that there was something missing on the side both of the intellectual and of the social interests which attracted and engaged their own minds. Dr. Vaughan, indeed, may seem to some, as he does to the reviewer, to do less than justice to Mr. Simeon, and it is as impossible to credit the Tractarians with full understanding from the outset of the social needs of the times as it is the Evangelicals. But Bishop Knox, who makes great play with what he regards as the necessary implications of Mr. Keble's undoubted Toryism, might have asked himself why a foreign Lutheran observer tackling the problem from the

standpoint of a research student engaged in writing an academic thesis should be led by his survey of the evidence to adopt so different a tone in endeavouring to describe the circumstances in which Evangelicals and Tractarians and Nonconformists alike found themselves called upon to meet the needs of a new age.

"Though the Church of England is twice mentioned in the sermon, the Preacher's gaze is really directed and his thoughts are concentrated on 'the Apostolical Church in these realms.'" The reader of this description of the famous Assize Sermon of July 14, 1833, may well wonder what inference the Bishop expects him to draw, since he will probably be right in thinking that though he finds Macaulay acclaimed as an Evangelical he is not expected to accept as historical either the picture of Cranmer or the account of the origin of the Church of England provided by Macaulay's review of Hallam in the *Quarterly Review* (1828). The necessarily compressed account of the origin of the Sermon rightly insists that the Irish Church legislation of 1833 did not justify the extreme view taken of it by Mr. Keble and his friends, as indeed Sir J. T. Coleridge pointed out long ago in his Life of Keble, but a study of the proceedings in Parliament would at least have done something to account for the view which was taken. The historical student has to consider these things if his judgment of persons is to be fair, whatever his estimate may be of the ultimate consequences of their actions, and the historian of the Tractarian Movement should no more neglect the first edition of Mr. Palmer's *Narrative of Events* in preference for the edition of 1883 than he should omit to deal with Mr. Perceval's *Collection of Papers* in an account of the Hadleigh Conference and the Association of Friends of the Church or to re-read Miss Porter's *Scottish Chiefs* if he wishes to understand one influence in the development of Cardinal Newman or Milner's *Church History* if he wishes to appreciate another. The kind of criticism which Bishop Knox applies when he speaks of the later ramifications of the Oxford Revival as "Romanism, Modernism, and Socialism," or says that "the Oxford Movement itself leaned far too much on what the Fathers or the Caroline Divines had said, and took too little pains to sound the wisdom or reasonableness of the authors to whom its studies were devoted," tends as little to the understanding of the Movement which he sets out to describe as his estimate of the *Tracts for the Times* when compared with his personal view of the history of the Reformation Period and of the Thirty-Nine Articles helps to elucidate the standpoint of the writers of the Tracts themselves; and the reference to "the sophistry of devout men" is as unfortunate—to use no stronger term—as the statement that "in the end political warfare

wrecked any hope that Ireland might once more become the land of Saints." This appearance of unfairness, however unintentional, is the more to be regretted because it militates against a better understanding of the great and lasting value of the Reformation and, as the reviewer is unfashionable enough to think, of the Thirty-Nine Articles historically understood.

In a chapter entitled "The Turn of the Tide" the Bishop describes the submission of John Henry Newman to Rome and adds "with his reception, the Oxford Movement, properly so-called, was ended." Had it really been so, the last part of the book would have been deprived of its controversial acuteness. Would it be disrespectful to suggest that Bishop Knox has found it as difficult as the Rev. Charles Kingsley to answer the question, "What then does Dr. Newman mean?" It would at any rate be scarcely unfair to add that for the difficulty Dr. Newman himself cannot be acquitted of all measure of responsibility either then or later in the Roman Church, as anyone may judge for himself who reads through his works with care and also Dom Cuthbert Butler's *Life of Bishop Ullathorne*. But the question, "What did the Tractarian movement mean?" would not be answered simply by saying—the secession of Newman and Ward and many others to Rome—so long as Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey and their followers continued to exercise a steadily increasing influence in a Church which they continued to believe to be "the Apostolical Church in these realms." The last fifty pages of the text of the Bishop's book are by far the most important and deserve to be read especially by those who are least likely to feel able to adopt the writer's point of view; but their importance lies in the fact that they reveal a misunderstanding which is capable of being dealt with apart from the acceptance or rejection of the Bishop's view of the events which marked the years 1833-1845. The "Appeal to all Christian People" put forth by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 would at any rate never have been issued at all if those of many different views who joined in it had felt their divergence one from another to be so irreconcilable as it is here represented.

In a future edition some minor points such as the misspelling of the name of Archbishop Whately throughout the book, the spelling of Mr. Perceval's name, and some curious omissions from the index (Mr. Venn is certainly worthy of a mention), and some wrong page references in it might with advantage be considered.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., PRINTERS, GUILDFORD AND ESHER